NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

Without Concealment----Without Compromise.

VOLUME VIII.—NO. 41. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 1848. WHOLE NUMBER 405.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY,
BY THE
AMERICAN A. S. SOCIETY.
At 142 Nassau Street, New-York.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, Editor.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to the Editor.

☞ Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti Slavery Society may be forwarded to FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer, at Boston; or to S. H. Gay, Assistant Treasurer, at New-York.

TERMS.—One Dollar per annum: Strictly in advance in all cases.

H. M. HENRY, PRINTER.

"The Peculiar Institution."

From the Western Citizen.

LIFE AT THE SOUTH—EXPERIENCE WITH SLAVERY.

ALTON, ILL. Dec. 28, 1847.

MR. EASTMAN,—DEAR SIR:—I was born April 25, 1809, in Lincoln county, Georgia. My parents were poor, but by persevering industry and economy, they accumulated enough to purchase a farm, and when I was about eight or ten years of age, my father commenced purchasing coloured people. In a few years he purchased some six or eight, and employed a superintendent, (most commonly called an overseer,) who generally carries what is called a hunter—which is a long platted whip, and frequently with lead or something heavy in the large end, to knock the coloured persons down, if they resist or refuse to take the lash.

They also frequently carry pistols, to shoot them if they run, and dirks to stab them if they are not very submissive to the lash.

In the fall or winter, or cotton picking time, they are generally tasked so many pounds of cotton to pick out of the open balls, and I have seen them (with an aching heart,) receive a stroke from their long whips, for each pound of cotton they failed in coming up to their task. I have begged and plead to stop the lashing of the poor slave, but generally, I might as well speak to the nether millstone to run with the swiftness of the upper, as to speak in behalf of the poor slave.

I have worked by the side of the oppressed slave, days, weeks, and years; therefore, I have seen much of the barbarity of Slavery. At an early age I felt for the present and eternal welfare of the negroes, as they are called at the South. I have repeatedly purchased small books containing the alphabet, and given them to the slaves; requesting them to learn to read, that they might be able to study the Holy Scriptures. I have refused teaching a choice class of whites in the Sabbath School, when I was about twelve years of age; and in preference, went with the coloured people to the woods, to teach them to read the Word of God. I feel thankful that I can say that my parents were never very cruel to slaves, in lashing them or suffering it to be done by others. If I am not very much mistaken, it is a penitentiary crime to teach negroes or slaves in the State of Georgia, and also in several other slaveholding States. I wish to obey the laws of God and man, so far as man's laws are consistent with the laws of God and no further. Had I not better suffer the consequences of disobeying the corrupt laws of any country, than to break the law of God? Judge ye.

I consider it a great misfortune to be born and raised in a slave State, where so many thousands of the white population are raised to become cruel oppressors of the poor coloured people; and how thankful I should be to the Almighty, that I never could become so hardened in oppression, as to remain in a slave State, where I could not easily shun seeing the desperate cruelties inflicted on the coloured people. How could any man of human feeling live there and raise his children there, with the probability of their becoming cruel persecutors of the poor slaves, as thousands have?

I recollect when I was a school-boy, in passing a house, I saw a white man lashing a poor female slave, having her stripped from the waist up, for some trivial, or perhaps no offence. I immediately stopped my course, and commenced begging for her; he agreed to stop lashing her, provided I would agree to be her security for her good conduct for the future, and if she offended again, that I must take the lash in her stead. I very readily agreed to any of his binding cruelties, in order to stop the brutal lash. I heard nothing farther afterwards, except that she was very thankful that I had been the means of stopping her sufferings under the lash, for she had been badly whipped when I first saw them.

I recollect again, when I was a lad, being in Harrisburgh, near Augusta, Georgia, and seeing a poor slave taken up for a runaway, tied up by the hands to a shed, stripped and whipped unmercifully. I wished some one to beg for him, but to no purpose; his cries and screams were desperate. I trembled for him, but the monster in human shape lashed him until he appeared wearied for want of breath, and then spoke to another to take his place. Some one then observed that he had had enough; and then the poor slave was taken to jail to await the cruelties of his master. Well may it be said that the tender mercies of the wicked are cruel! is it not found in Holy Writ?

Being raised in the country on a farm, and but seldom from home, I did not see so much of the cruelty of Slavery as otherwise I should—my parents being merciful in many respects. But how heart-rending to see many poor slaves passing and re-passing without clothing enough to shield them from the blasts of winter, and thousands who do not have food enough, even of the coarsest kind, to appease their hunger—with but one or two blankets to cover themselves at night, compelled to lie upon the dirty floor, to rest their limbs, aching, wearied, and sometimes lacerated with the lash! I have seen black nurses, cooks, &c. when in reach of their mistress, begin to dodge their heads, expecting a slap or a blow; and that mistress, so mild and gentle in appearance, except, when with the servants. Indeed, most of the Southern females wear a perpetual frown in the presence of their servants, and sometimes this angry look becomes so common that it cannot be hidden in the presence of the whites, and thus it grows with their growth, and strengthens with their strength; and being in the habit of speaking angry words to the slaves, in a spiteful manner, they are led to use the same manner towards their children and husbands, thus embittering their happiness for life.

Thus it is going on from generation to generation, until they see but little if any pleasure in this life, and as for what will become of them hereafter, is not for me to say—the Holy Scriptures will give some idea of such living and dying. When a white man is found speaking kindly to a poor slave, he is generally looked upon as an Abolitionist, or some contemptible being, and an Abolitionist, by many persons in the Southern or slave States, is considered an insurrectionist—a person who would have the slaves rise against the slaveholders, and kill men, women, and children; and many would not believe otherwise if any person were to tell them better.

Would the people only consider and think how many poor slaves are suffering, at this moment, with the lash, cold, hunger, imprisonment, and many afflictions or tortures, invented by the wicked monsters of the earth, would not their heart's desire go up to God, that the oppressed might go free? Who can expect to inherit eternal happiness unless they do by others as they would wish others to do by them? Who would not wish to be freed if they were slaves? Therefore every slaveholder, if he obeys the blessed Saviour's Golden Rule, would surely say,—Go free—as I would wish you to free me if I belonged to you. So when slaveholders become real Christians, they surely will say to their poor servants—henceforth you shall be as free as I am.

There are many masters who feed and clothe well, and treat their servants kindly, so that some even go so far as to say that many are satisfied in their bondage. But how can they, when they do not know what moment, hour, day, or year, they may be sold and torn from their wives and children.. All know that at the death of their master, there will be a separation of some of them, or when their young masters or mistresses marry, that their children, or sometimes husband and wife are separated in different States. How unreasonable then, is it to say that some are content with their Slavery—the greatest sin and curse in our land. Parents and children, husbands and wives, are many times compelled to see each other lashed or beat unmercifully for little or no offence, by their masters, when in a passion about other matters, and if they should say a word in their behalf, they are apt to receive the same, a knock down or something, desperate; and where is the true minister of the Gospel, who will not speak against the most hateful sin on earth? Yes, I consider Slavery the most abominable of any evil whatever. They surely hold their peace to follow the majority, which I fear will be found lacking oil for their lamps at the great day of accounts. May the good Lord give us grace sufficient to speak boldly against every evil in the land—particularly the greatest one.

JESSE WALTON.

Selections.

We are indebted to the Hon. John P. Hale for the following document. It is a proof of how Anti-Slavery is going down at Washington:

REPORT

Of the Minority of the Committee on Military Affairs, on the Petition of the Legal Representatives of Antonio Pacheco, praying compensation for a slave.

February 9, 1848.

Mr. Dickey submitted the following, as the views of the minority of the Committee on Military Affairs, upon the petition of the legal representatives of Antonio Pacheco:

Upon the petition of Antonio Pacheco's heirs a minority of the Committee on Military Affairs ask leave to report:

That the facts in this case are distinctly set forth in the report of the majority, viz: "That Pacheco was the owner of a negro slave named Lewis, who was hired by an officer of the army, duly authorized, from his owner, as an interpreter and guide to the defeated command of Major Dade: that he was one of the few survivors of the disastrous defeat of that command, and remained either voluntarily or as a captive amongst the hostile Indians until the spring of 1837, when he accompanied Jumper, a Seminole chief, to one of our military posts in Florida; that he was then claimed by his owner, and the military commander, in whose control he was, refused to deliver him to his owner, and ordered that he be sent with the Indians to the West; because he deemed his transportation proper inasmuch as he was considered capable of exercising an injurious influence over the Indians; and thus, in pursuance of this order, he was transported to the west, and the owner thereby deprived of his value."

The undersigned being unable to coincide with the majority of said Committee, have been induced, from the importance of the questions involved, to place before the House some of the reasons which have led them to a satisfactory conclusion that the petitioners are not entitled to relief. Before entering upon the principal question involved in the consideration of this claim, the undersigned would remark, that in no aspect of the case can they regard it as valid. Admitting, for the sake of argument, that the slave was *property* in every sense of that term, it appears very clearly to the minds of the undersigned, that compensation cannot be granted according to well-known and established usages which have controlled this Government from its earliest history.

The military officers of Government are its special agents, limited in their sphere of action, but authorized to bind the Government as far as their legitimate powers extend, and no farther. Thus a military officer may undoubtedly bind his Government, so far as may be necessary to provide the men under his command with the ordinary rations to sustain them, if not provided by the other agents of Government; but if they be furnished by the Government, and the officer purchases, upon the public credit, wines, or chocolate, or other luxuries, such contract places the Government under no moral obligation to pay for them. The rule in regard to military officers is nearly the same as that in civil life. While the agent acts strictly within the limits of his authority he binds his principal, but when he transcends his authority his acts become his own, for which he alone is liable. These principles have been so often decided that it would seem useless to quote precedents.

And now, admitting this man Lewis to have been the property of the petitioner, had the officer who sent him west of the Mississippi legal authority to bind his Government by such act? Had the same officer taken the horse or the ox of the petitioner, and sent him west of the Mississippi, in the same manner, would the Government have been bound to pay for him? Certainly not. The officer, if necessary to transport his baggage or provisions, would have possessed authority to hire, or even to purchase, or to impress into the service horses or oxen for that purpose. But he had no authority to hire, purchase, or impress a horse or ox to send out of the country. Such act would have rendered the officer liable, but not the Government.

Taking the negro, had he been property, for the purpose of sending him west of the Mississippi would not have constituted a "*taking for the public use.*" He cannot be regarded as *used* by the public while he is pursuing his happiness in the western country. Not being taken for public use, the taking was the act of the officer, for which the Government is not responsible under the practice which has been followed since our existence as a nation.

But questions of the most grave importance seem legitimately involved in this case. The character of Slavery and the constitutional relation which the Federal Government and the people of the free States hold to that institution, must necessarily be determined before we can arrive at a satisfactory conclusion upon the case presented.

1st. As to the character of Slavery. In the earlier ages, many nations of the earth regarded war as the only honourable employment of man. When prisoners were captured, it was supposed that the victor had the legitimate right to deprive them of life, or to save the life of the prisoner and hold him as a slave. Thus, Slavery is regarded by most writers as one of the resulting consequences of war. The prisoners captured were held by physical force, and whenever they made their escape they became free. To effect their escape, they might use any means within their power, provided they did not injure innocent persons.

The practice of taking prisoners of war continues to this day, but the holding of prisoners as slaves has long since ceased among civilized nations, although it has been but recently abandoned by the semi-barbarians of Algiers and Tunis.

The practice of seizing upon the unoffending people of Africa, and bringing them to the American continent and holding them as slaves, followed the abrogation of that of holding prisoners of war in perpetual servitude; and, although the importation of slaves to these States has been interdicted by law since the year 1808, it is still openly continued by one of the Governments on the American continent, and clandestinely practised by citizens of other Governments.

The inhabitants of Africa are seized in violation of the dictates of humanity and of the natural rights of man. They are torn from their native land by physical force, and, while on board the slave-ships, are held in subjection by chains and fetters. It is perfectly clear that they had at all times the most indisputable right to release themselves from bondage by any means which God and nature had placed within their power. That right descended to their offspring, and still continues. They owe no allegiance whatever to our Government; it has never extended to them its protection, and can demand from them, by no principle of reason or justice, any support. Thus it is said, with great force, that Slavery is a state of war between the slaves and those who oppress them. All his feelings are opposed to the laws and the Government which holds him in subjection. Thus, the slave "Lewis," whose master now claims at the hands of Congress a compensation for his body, was held in servitude by the local laws of Florida, which authorized his master to chastise him into obedience to his own will. To his master, nor to the Government of Florida, nor to that of the United States, was he under any moral obligations of friendship or obedience. He had the most clear and indisputable moral right to relieve himself from servitude at the earliest practicable moment. When he joined the enemy, after Dade's defeat, his master, the Government, and the laws of Florida lost their control over him. He then became *free*. From that time, he acted in concert with our enemies, and was one of them. Had he been slain in battle, no one would have supposed the United States liable to the master. When he submitted to our arms, together with his Indian allies, he did so as an enemy, and thereby became a "prisoner of war," in the same manner and entitled to the same rights and privileges to which his fellow prisoners were entitled. The officer in command was fully authorized to extend to him the same terms of capitulation which he extended to others. Those terms had been prescribed and made known both to him and to the Indians. Those propositions were, that they should emigrate west of the Mississippi. In these terms there were no exceptions. See Doc. 225, 3d session, 25th Congress.

Under these stipulations, and the pledged faith of the Government, he submitted as a prisoner of war to an officer of the United States. It is said that the petitioner then claimed him. What claim had he to this prisoner? The answer is, that he had no more claim to the negro than the negro would have had to the master, had he been taken prisoner by the enemy. Having been *free*, there was no law of Florida, or of the Federal Government, by which he could have been re-enslaved. There is no practice or usage of civilized nations at this day which could justify the re-enslaving of this man Lewis. It would have reflected dishonour upon the Government to have violated its faith by enslaving those prisoners who had come in under a promise of being transported west of the Mississippi. The officer to whom he surrendered was not authorized by any law to decide upon the fact of his being a slave. There was no mark by which he could ascertain whether the prisoner *had been* a slave or not. The question of his right to liberty could not be legally passed upon or decided by a military officer in the service of the United States. That would have been a judicial question, could it have been raised, which no mere military officer of this Government was authorized to determine.

If the petitioner had any legal right to the custody of the man Lewis, [which is by no means admitted,] it was his duty to have enforced it by judicial process, by which the negro could have been brought before competent authority, and the legal claim of the petitioner could have been determined. But the undersigned deny that the petitioner could stand by and see the negro carried beyond the Mississippi, and then turn round, and as a consequence of his own neglect, call on the Government to pay him for such servant. Again, the negro was neither killed nor maimed, but was discharged out of custody of the officer, and the petitioner may now enforce his claim to him if he has any. There is the slave; if the petitioner has had any legal right to him since he was taken, that right remains unimpaired, and the petitioner is at full liberty to enforce it judicially; but while he thus sleeps upon his rights, the undersigned are unable to discover any good cause why the Government should award him a compensation for said slave. These objections present themselves to the undersigned as insuperable at the very threshold of the case.

Besides these difficulties, however, there are other considerations which themselves with great solemnity to the judgment of the Committee.

The legislative branch of this Government are now called upon to recognize slaves as *property* under the Constitution of the United States, and the undersigned have therefore examined this part of the case with some care.

It is undoubtedly true that during the earlier ages, slaves were regarded by many nations as a species of property. Indeed, we find that as late as 1749, Lord Chancellor Hardwick decided that trover lay for a West India slave, before the Courts of Great Britain. But such was the progress of public opinion, that in 1772, Lord Mansfield, with the unanimous concurrence of all the Judges of the King's Bench, decided, in the celebrated case of Somerset, (see 20, State Trials,) that a slave brought upon British soil became *ipso facto* free. In his closing remarks, he said, "*The state of slavery is of such a nature that it is incapable of being introduced on any reasons moral or political, but only by positive law. It is so odious that nothing can be suffered to support it but positive law.*" From the time of Lord Hardwick's decision to that of Lord Mansfield, no act of Parliament had changed the English law in any respect whatever, and the revolution in the judicial branch of Government resulted entirely from the force of public sentiment. Yet slaves were at that time held in all the colonies which subsequently formed the States of this Union at the time of adopting the Constitution. But the patriots of that day were inspired with the great and important truths relating to the rights of man. The Convention which put forth our Declaration of Independence on the 4th of July, 1776, proclaimed those great principles which challenged the admiration of the world. They declared it to be a "self-evident truth," that men were born free and equal, with inalienable rights, among which were life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to protect those rights, governments are formed among men deriving their just powers from the *consent* of the governed." No form of language could more forcibly deny that men can be made property, than this Declaration of the sages of American freedom.

In 1817 the Convention met to frame our Federal Constitution; and it is important to understand the light in which they viewed this question.

Mr. Madison in his papers informs us that on

"Wednesday, August 22d, the Convention proceeded to consider the report of the Committee of Detail, in relation to duties on exports, a capitation tax and a navigation act. The fourth section reported was as follows:

"'No tax or duty shall be laid by the Legislature on articles exported from any State, nor on the migration nor importation of such persons as the several States shall think proper to admit; nor shall such migration nor importation be prohibited.'

"Mr. Gerry thought we had nothing to do with the conduct of the States as to Slavery; *but we ought to be careful not to give any sanction.*

"Mr. Sherman was opposed to any tax on slaves imported, as making the matter worse, *because it implied they were property.*

"The whole subject was again committed to a committee of eleven, which, August 24th, reported as follows, concerning the 4th section:

"'Strike out so much of the 4th section as was referred to the committee, and insert, "the migration or importation of such persons as the several States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Legislature prior to the year 1800; but a tax may be imposed on such migration or importation, at a rate *not exceeding the average of the duties laid on imports.*'

"The next day the report was taken up, and amended by substituting 1808 for 1800; and the first part was then adopted.

"Mr. Gorham thought Mr. Sherman should consider the duty *not as implying that slaves are property*, but as a discouragement to the importation of them."

The discussion, it will be observed, turned upon the peculiar phraseology of the second part of the report, which, in classifying slaves with merchandise, seemed to imply that they were property. No one expressed a desire that such an idea should be embodied in the Constitution; on the contrary, there was a manifest desire on the part of the Members of the Convention to explain the phraseology as to exclude the construction given to it by Mr. Sherman. Mr. Madison, it seems, agreed with that gentleman. He thus reports himself:

"Mr Madison *thought it wrong to admit in the Constitution the idea that there could be property in man.*

"Col. Mason (in answer to Mr. Gouverneur Morris)—The provision as it now stands *was necessary for the case of convicts*, in order to prevent the introduction of them.

"Still, the Convention was not satisfied; and it was finally agreed, *nem. con.*, to have the clause read.

"'But a tax or duty may be imposed on such importation, not exceeding ten dollars *for each person.*'

"And then the second part, as amended, was agreed to."

And thus it stands to this day.

This is one of the most important facts on record. It demonstrates, beyond all doubt, the settled purpose of the Federal Convention carefully to exclude from the Constitution they were framing, the idea that there could be property in man; and that the term "persons," was used when slaves were referred to, with the intention that, so far as the Constitution was concerned, they were always to be regarded as *persons*, and not as *property*. Mr. Sherman was opposed to the clause, "*as acknowledging men to be* PROPERTY." Mr. Madison was also opposed to it, because he "*thought it* WRONG TO ADMIT IN THE CONSTITUTION THE IDEA THAT THERE COULD BE PROPERTY IN MAN."

And the clause was so amended to exclude in express terms the idea that there could be property in man.

These views appear to have fully accorded with the public sentiment of that period. In every instance in which reference to slaves is made in the Constitution, they are termed 'persons. Thus, in fixing the ratio of representation, it provides that "the number shall be ascertained by adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all *other persons.*" It is clear that the framers not only regarded slaves as persons, but they were spoken of as *other* persons; thus placing them upon the same general basis as freemen. In the 9th section of the first article, the Constitution provides that "the migration or importation of such *persons* as any of the States shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited until the year 1808," &c. Here, again, the language is carefully used to distinguish slaves from property. Again, in the second section of the third article, the Constitution provides—"No *person* held to service or labour in one State under the laws thereof, and escaping into another, shall, by any law or regulation thereof, be discharged from such service or labour." Thus, in every instance in which the Constitution refers to slaves, they are designated as *persons*, contradistinguishing them from property. We are not only informed that the framers of the Constitution regarded it as wrong to admit in the Constitution "that there could be property in man," but they carefully employed such language, in framing that instrument, as to exclude such an idea. The undersigned regard this subject as separated from all uncertainty or doubt; so that any man who carefully examines it, must be convinced, that to regard slaves as property, under our Federal Constitution, would be to pervert the language of the Constitution, and to defeat the recorded intention of those who framed it.

The undersigned are further confirmed in this conclusion, by the decision of this point by the highest judicial authority known to the Constitution. In the case of Groves v. Slaughter and others (15 Peters's Reports, 449), this question came distinctly before the Supreme Court of the United States. The Constitution of Mississippi had prohibited the introduction of slaves into that State after a certain day. Slaves were taken there and sold on a credit after the time allowed by the Constitution of that State. Suit was commenced on the note given, in consideration of the slaves. The defence was, that the contract was illegal and void under the Constitution of that State, which prohibited the sale, therein of slaves from without the State. The reply to this was, that slaves were *property*, and therefore the State of Mississippi had no power to prohibit their introduction into the State, as the power to regulate commerce between the States, belonged only to Congress. In deciding the law, Judge McLean said—"By the laws of certain States, slaves are treated as property; and the Constitution of Mississippi prohibits their being brought into that State by citizens of other States for sale or as merchandise. Merchandise is a comprehensive term, and may include every article of traffic, whether foreign or domestic, which is properly embraced by a commercial regulation. But if slaves are considered in some of the States as merchandise, that cannot divest them of the leading and controlling quality of persons, by which they are designated in the Constitution. The character of property is given them by the local law. The law is respected, and all rights under it are protected by the Federal authorities; but the Constitution acts upon slaves as persons, and not as property."

If slaves be property, it follows that Congress may regulate the interstate Slave trade. They may prohibit the transportation of slaves from one State to another; or they may authorize the establishment of slave markets in each State of the Union, under such regulations as may be deemed reasonable. If slaves, under our Constitution, be regarded as property, then, indeed, no individual State has power to prohibit Slavery within its jurisdiction. The Constitution of several States declare that there shall be neither Slavery nor involuntary servitude within such State. But if slaves be regarded as property under our Federal compact, then no State of the Union has power to consecrate its soil to freedom. No State can, under our Federal Constitution, exclude horses or property of any kind from being brought into it and sold. If, therefore, slaves be property, they may be transported to New York or New England, and held there, and sold like other property. But those who regard slaves as property, will hardly contend for such a right.

The undersigned are conscious that doubts on this subject have long existed in the minds of some statesmen and jurists who have been born and educated in States where slaves are held to be property by the force of the local laws. Being accustomed to regard them as property, they draw no distinction between the laws of the slave States, and those of the Federal Government. Persons thus educated in the Slave States, coming into the office of President, or into either of the Executive Departments, or into either House of Congress, are likely to bring with them the views imbibed in such States. Thus we find that in some instances the President of the United States, and other officers of the Government, have, at times, without examination, regarded slaves as property; and, in some instances, have paid the public funds for such slaves, not only without authority of law, but in opposition to the spirit and letter of the Federal compact. The same officers, after having their attention called particularly to the subject, have seen their error, changed their practice, and refused to regard slaves as property. So, also, in some of our treaties, slaves are referred to in connection with other property. Thus our treaty with Great Britain, of 1814, speaks of "negroes or other property." So too in some of our treaties with the Indians, the same language is used. But in all these cases the undersigned have reasons to believe the framers of these treaties neither examined the subject, nor is it probable that they even thought of any distinction between the relation which the Federal Government holds to Slavery, and that maintained by the Government of the slave States. And it is proper to remark, that, in making treaties with foreign nations, the Government is controlled solely by the law of nations. Under these circumstances, the undersigned feel that the language employed in those treaties can form no precedent for the discharge of our legislative duties when this precise question is presented for our decision.

It is also the case that in some instances the courts in free States have carelessly applied to slaves the term "property." But the Committee have searched in vain for a case in which slaves are *decided* to be property *under the Federal Constitution.* It is believed that no court, either of the free or of the slave States, or of the United States, have made decisions to that extent, while it has already been shown that the Supreme Court of the United States have decided that they are not property. Nor are they regarded merely as property in any of the slave States. In every State of the Union they are punishable for their crimes under the State laws: such is not the case with any species of property. Murder may be committed upon slaves in any State, and the murderer hanged therefor. But no such punishment applies to the killing of any other species of property. Slaves, in such States, are, however, for certain purposes under their laws, regarded as a "*peculiar kind of property.*" But the laws of those States are local, and have no bearing upon the relation which the Federal Government holds to the institution. Slavery is the creature of municipal law, and can extend no farther than such municipal enactment has force. It is, therefore, strictly confined to the jurisdiction creating it. So strictly is this rule of law observed by courts of justice, that if a slave escape from his master on to free soil, but, for a moment, he becomes free for ever. Thus, in the case of Forbes v. Cochran, et al, (vide 2, Barnwell & Cresswell, 448.) Bayley, justice, remarked—"Slavery is a local law, and, therefore, if a man wish to preserve his slaves, let him attach them to him by affection, or make fast the bars of their prison, or rivet well their chains; for the instant they get beyond the limits where Slavery is recognized by the local laws, they have broken their chains—they have escaped from their prison—they are free." The same principles were decided in the case of Somerset (see 20 vol. State trials), and are recognized by the courts of the United States, and by those of nearly all of the several States of this Union. See 2 Marshall, Rep. 467 1st Leigh, Rep. 127; Gilmer's, Rep. 143; 2 Mumford, 393; 5th Read, Rep. 126; Walker's Mississippi, Reps. 36. In the latter case, the court say—"*Slavery is condemned by reason and the laws of nature. It exists, and can exist, only through municipal regulations.*" *Property* may be taken by the owner from one State to another, or from one nation to another; but, if a man voluntarily take his slave, or send him to a free State, the moment he enters such State he becomes a freeman. From that moment his master's power over him ceases, and he can no more be enslaved.

But the undersigned feel that it is the duty of statesmen to meet out justice with an even hand to all the people of our Government. In order to do this, long-existing usages, and well-established precedents, must be followed. Instability in legislation, creates distrust, and destroys confidence in the legislative body. The undersigned have, therefore, looked into the former practice of Congress on this subject, and they find but one principle has ever been acknowledged by Congress, in regard to the question under consideration. The legislative branch of Government has never regarded slaves as property; nor has any claim for the payment of Slaves, either lost or killed in public service, been paid by law of Congress, except, perhaps, in one or two instances. The only law which the undersigned have found, is the case of Depeyster, which passed the House of Representatives without, discussion or examination, at the 1st session, 28th Congress (see laws of that session).

It is within the personal knowledge of at least one of the undersigned, that the bill in that case was regarded by some of the older members of the house as unsustained by principle, and opposed to the entire practice of the Government, since we have been a nation. But it passed while such members were absent from the House, or, at least, without their attention being called to it, and one of those days in which no discussion is permitted. As it passed without discussion or examination, it can, with no propriety, be said to form a precedent for other cases, particularly when the House of Representatives has frequently passed upon this question upon full examination, and have as uniformly refused to pay for the loss of persons held as slaves. The case of Francis Larche, is one familiar to most of those who have served long in Congress. The petitioner in that case owned a slave, horse, and cart—all of which were in his service near New Orleans, in 1814. The day of the battle near that city, the slave, horse, and cart, were impressed into the public service, by order of the commanding officer. During the battle, the negro and horse were killed, and the cart destroyed by the cannon and shot of the enemy. The owner subsequently applied to Congress for compensation. The case was referred to the Committee on Claims, who reported in favour of paying for the horse and cart, but against paying for the slave. See House Reports, 1 sess. 21 Congress, vol. 3, No. 401. This is, perhaps, the strongest possible case. The owner had not hired the slave to Government, but the Slave had been impressed against the will of the owner. If any case could be attended with circumstances which demanded pay from the Government for the loss of a slave, this was surely such a case; yet the Committee, composed of men from the southern States, as well as from the northern States, appear to have come to the unanimous conclusion, that the allowance of this claim would be an overturning of the established usages of the Government. They say, in their report, that they had caused examination to be made at the Treasury Department, to see if slaves who had been killed in public service during the revolutionary war, had been paid for; and they learned that no such instance could be found. They also cite a number of cases where claims were made for slaves killed, and those who died in the public service during the war of 1812, all of which were rejected.

On the 9th of April, 1816, Congress passed an act entitled, "An Act to Authorize the Payment for Property Lost, or Captured, or Destroyed by the Enemy while in the Military Service of the United States." A motion was made to amend the bill, so as to include *slaves* lost or killed in the public service; but the amendment was rejected. Another attempt was made to amend a similar bill on the 24th January, 1825, but the amendment was again rejected. These express decisions of the House, and the number of reports against claims for payment of slaves lost in the public service, would seem to have permanently established the principles which should govern us in the present case. But several cases of this description have, within the last five or six years, been reported upon favourably; and efforts have been made to change the established usage of the Government in cases of this description. At the 2d session of the 27th Congress the Committee on Territories reported a bill for the relief of the people of West Florida, by which provisions were made for the payment of slaves taken from their owners by the army under General Jackson, in 1814. This bill was opposed on the ground that slaves were *persons, and not property*; and when the final vote was taken by yeas and nays, the claim was rejected. But enumeration of particular cases can add no strength to the position assumed by the undersigned. From the first session of the first Congress down to the present day, no case can be found in which the Legislative branch of Government has, upon examination and discussion of this subject, admitted slaves to be *property*. Many claims of this character have been rejected. The action of the House has at all times been opposed to allowing claims of this description, having, for more that half a century, regarded slaves as persons and not as property. The undersigned can now see no good reason for reversing the principles on which Congress has so long acted, and overturn the plainly-expressed intention of those who framed our Federal compact.

But the undersigned are deeply impressed with the important principles involved in this case, which yet remain to be examined. The time seems rapidly approaching when the relation which the Federal Government holds to the institution of Slavery, under the Constitution, must be examined and determined. The undersigned are conscious that they cannot do justice to their own views of this case without defining, with some degree of precision, the Constitutional powers of the Federal Government in respect to Slavery. They find that, prior to the adoption of the Federal Constitution, each of the several States entering into the compact had full, perfect, and absolute control over the institution of Slavery within its own boundary, and could continue or abolish it at the pleasure of its people. By adopting the Constitution, none of these powers were delegated to the Federal Government; but each of the several States retained to itself the same powers in relation to Slavery, which it had previously possessed. A portion of the States, in pursuance of their most obvious constitutional rights, have abolished that institution. Other States, by virtue of the same right, still continue to sustain it. Nor has Congress the constitutional power to interfere with the exercise of those rights. The several States, having retained to themselves all powers not delegated to the Federal Government, each may now sustain Slavery, or it may entirely separate itself from all participation in the support of that institution. The rights of the several States on this subject are equal and perfectly reciprocal. The Federal Government, in the opinion of the undersigned, possesses no power to involve the slave States in the Abolition of their "peculiar institution." Nor has it the right to involve the free States in its support. It is strictly a State institution, over which Congress has no control, except to legislate for the recapture of fugitive slaves, as provided for in the last clause, 2d section of the 4th article of the Constitution. With this one exception, the undersigned entertain the opinion that Congress possesses no jurisdiction over that subject, and is totally destitute of all power to legislate, either to uphold or destroy it. The Federal Government belongs equally to all the States; and when it puts forth its powers, it must act for all the people of all the States. It follows, as a corollary, that it cannot act where Slavery is concerned. If it acts against Slavery, it must encroach upon the rights of the slave States; if it act for the support of that institution, it will equally encroach upon the rights of the free States; for they hold their right to be free from what they regard the guilt of Slavery to be as supreme as that of the people of the South to be free from its abolition. The framers of the Constitution, as we learn from the discussions at the time of its adoption, intended to leave the institution of Slavery entirely with the States. It is in vain that we look to that instrument for any powers conferred on Congress over Slavery. These opinions are believed to be fully borne out by the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. See Groves v. Slaughter, 15 Peters' Rep. p. 449; also, case of Prigg v. the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 16 Peters' Reports.

This doctrine, so prominent in the discussions at the time of adopting the Constitution, and which, it is believed, has not only been confirmed by judicial decisions of the courts of the United States, but by those of the different States, has been frequently recognized by the House of Representatives. By an almost unanimous vote in December, 1838, it was resolved *that this Government is a Government of limited powers; that, by the Constitution of the United States, it has no power whatever over the institution of Slavery in the several States of this Union.*" It would be useless to quote other resolutions or acts of this House to prove a proposition so well known and understood by all intelligent men. So far has this doctrine been carried, that, for many years, it was regarded as a useless occupation of time, even to receive petitions asking us to act in any way touching the institution of Slavery, even in the District of Columbia, where it exists by act of Congress, and such petitions, by a standing rule of the House, were laid on the table without being read or referred.

It seemed to have been the unanimous opinion of statesmen, that Congress possessed no powers whatever in relation to Slavery. A distinguished Senator, in speaking before that body on this subject, in 1839, said—"According to the compromises of the Constitution, no power whatever was granted to the Federal Government in respect to domestic Slavery, but that which relates to taxation, representation, and the power to restore fugitive slaves. All other power," said he, "in regard to the institution of Slavery, was retained exclusively by the States." This was spoken in the presence of that learned body; and no member, it is believed, either denied or doubted the doctrine advanced.

The undersigned entertain the same sentiments. They feel that to legislate for the payment of slaves by this Government, or to appropriate the funds of the nation, drawn, in part, from the freemen of the North, for such a purpose, would be to involve the people of the free States in the support of an institution which they have discarded, which they regard as wrong, to which they are, morally and religiously opposed, and from the evils and burdens of which they are most obviously exempted by the constitutional compact.

The undersigned are not unconscious that the last clause of the second section of the fourth article of the Constitution has been referred to, to show that the Constitution has involved the free States in the support of Slavery. This, however, if true, must be limited to the terms to which that clause extends. It has no other reference to Slavery than regards fugitive slaves, and cannot properly be construed as extending further.—But we find, by the history of its adoption, that the framers were careful not to involve the people of the free States in the arrest or return of fugitive slaves. The covenant on the part of the free States is, that they will pass no law or regulations, nor do any acts, to relieve such fugitive from the service of his master. When that clause of the Constitution was before the Convention, a member from North Carolina moved to amend it so as to make it the duty of the people of the free States to arrest and imprison fugitive slaves, in the same manner as they were bound to arrest fugitives from justice.—But Mr. Wilson, of Pennsylvania, objected that such provision would involve the people of the free States in the expense of arresting and imprisoning slaves, and the amendment was rejected.

This is conclusive to show that no acts were to be done by the people of the free States in favour of fugitive slaves. Indeed, this very stipulation is to abstain from action. So clearly is that intention expressed on the face of the Constitution, that the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of Prigg vs. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, declared the States incompetent to legislate on the subject, and that the last clause of the section, which says "they shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labour may be due," imposes upon the people of the free States no other obligation than peaceably and quietly to permit the holder of the slave to enter such State and pursue and take his slave without molestation or hindrance. To the extent, then, of abstaining from all participation in aiding the slave to escape from service, the people of the free States are bound to uphold that institution, and no farther. The master cannot demand of them aid or assistance in retaking his slave. So far from this, some of the State Legislatures have, by statute law, rendered it penal for any citizen of such State (not being an officer of the United States) to render any assistance to the master in such case. Of the perfect constitutional power of the States to pass such laws, the undersigned entertain no doubts. And they are led to the conclusion that this provision of the Constitution gives no power, either expressly or by implication, to Congress, to legislate either for the benefit or the abolition of Slavery, except for the arrest of such fugitives; and, on that point, the powers of Congress extends no farther than to attach penalties to any act of interference on the part of those who defend, protect, or secrete the fugitive from arrest. The undersigned, after the most careful examination of this case, and of the important principles involved in its consideration, have been led to the conclusion—

Firstly.—That, admitting the man Lewis to have been the property of the petitioner, in the ordinary acceptation of that term, the circumstances of this case come within no established rule of compensation known in the practice of this Government.

Secondly.—That Lewis was a prisoner of war, and could not properly have been surrendered by the military officer in command to any person claiming him as a slave.

Thirdly.—That slaves, under the provisions of the Federal Constitution, are not regarded as property, and ought not to be paid for by the Government as such.

Fourthly.—That for Congress to allow compensation for the man Lewis, would be to reverse the entire system of legislation on the subject which controlled this body since the adoption of the Constitution, and would bespeak an instability of purpose which must necessarily impair the confidence now reposed in us by our constituents.

Fifthly.—That, by the Constitution of the United States, the Federal Government are not authorized to legislate upon the subject of Slavery, or in any manner to involve the people of the free States in the payment for slaves.

The undersigned, therefore, recommend to the consideration of the House the following resolution:

Resolved, That the petitioner is not entitled to relief.

JOHN DICKEY,
JAMES WILSON,
DAVID FISHER,
DUDLEY MARVIN.

From Gallatin's "Peace with Mexico."

THE CLAIM OF TEXAS TO THE RIO DEL NORTE, AS ITS BOUNDARY, EXAMINED.

From what precedes, it appears that the Government of the United States considered the refusal of Mexico to receive a resident Envoy or Minister as a sufficient cause for war; and the Rio Del Norte as the legitimate boundary of Texas. The first opinion is now of no importance; but the question of boundary, which was the immediate cause of hostilities, has to this day been the greatest impediment to the restoration of peace. I feel satisfied that, if this was settled, there would be no insuperable difficulty in arranging other pretensions.

The United States claim no other portion of the

Mexican dominions, unless it be by right of conquest. The tract of country between the Rio Nueces and the Del Norte, is the only one which has been claimed by both parties, as respectively belonging either to Texas or to Mexico. As regards every other part of the Mexican possessions, the United States never claimed any portion of it. The iniquity of acquiring any portion of it, otherwise than by fair compact freely consented to by Mexico, is self-evident. It is, in every respect, most important to examine the grounds on which the claim of the United States to the only territory claimed by both nations is founded. It is the main question at issue.

The Republic of Texas did, by an act of December, 1836, declare the Rio del Norte to be its boundary. It will not be seriously contended that a nation has a right, by a law of its own, to determine what is or shall be the boundary between it and another country. The act was nothing more than the expression of the wishes or pretensions of the Government. Its only practical effect was that, emanating from its Congress or Legislative body, it made it imperative on the Executive not to conclude any peace with Mexico, unless that boundary was agreed to. As regards right, the act of Texas is a perfect nullity. We want the arguments and documents by which the claim is sustained.

On a first view the pretension is truly startling. There is no exception: the Rio del Norte from its source to its mouth, is declared to be the rightful boundary of Texas. That river has its source within the Department, Province, or State of New Mexico, which it traverses through its whole length from North to South, dividing it into two unequal parts. The largest and most populous, including Santa Fe, the capital, lies on the left bank of the river, and is, therefore, embraced within the claim of Texas.—Now this province of New Mexico was first visited and occupied by the Spaniards under Vasquez Coronado, in the year 1540 to 1542. It was at that time voluntarily evacuated, subsequently revisited, and some settlements made about the year 1583; finally conquered in 1595 by the Spaniards, under the command of Onate. An insurrection of the Indians drove away the Spaniards in the year 1680. They re-entered it the ensuing year, and, after a long resistance, reconquered it. This was an internal conflict with the Aborigines; but, as related to Foreign Powers, the sovereignty of the Spaniards over the territory was never called in question; and it was, in express terms, made the Western boundary of Louisiana in the Royal Charter of the French Government.

The conquest of the province by Onate took place five and twenty years prior to the landing of the Pilgrims in New England, and twelve years before any perminent settlement had been made in North America, on the shores of the Atlantic, by either England, France, Holland, Sweden, or any other power, but that in Florida by Spain herself.

I have in vain sought for any document, emanating from the Republic or State of Texas, for the purpose of sustaining its claim either to New Mexico or the country bordering on the lower portion of the Del Norte. The only official papers within my reach, in which the claim of Texas is sustained, are the President's Messages of May 11, and December 3, 1846; and these refer only to the country bordering on the lower part of the Rio del Norte. The portion of the Message of May 11, 1846, relating to that subject, is as follows: "Meantime Texas, by the final action of our Congress, had become an integral part of our Union. The Congress of Texas, by its act of December 19, 1836, had declared the Rio del Norte to be the boundary of that Republic. Its jurisdiction had been extended and exercised beyond the Nueces. The country between that river and the del Norte had been represented in the Congress and in the Convention of Texas; had thus taken part in the act of annexation itself; and is now included within one of our Congressional Districts. Our own Congress had, moreover, with great unanimity, by the act approved December 31, 1845, recognized the country beyond the Nueces as a part of our territory; by including it within our own Revenue system, and a revenue officer, to reside within that District, has been appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. It became, therefore, of urgent necessity to provide for the defence of that portion of our country. Accordingly, on the 13th of January last, instructions were issued to the General in command of these troops to occupy the left bank of the del Norte.

"The movement of the troops to the del Norte was made by the Commanding General under positive instructions to abstain from all aggressive acts toward Mexico or Mexican citizens, and to regard the relations between the Republic and the United States as peaceful, unless she should declare war.—He was specially directed to protect private property, and respect personal rights."

In his annual message of December 8, 1846, the President states that Texas, as ceded to the United States by France in 1803, has been always claimed as extending west to the Rio Grande; that this fact is established by declarations of our Government during Mr. Jefferson's and Mr Munroe's administrations; and that the Texas which was ceded to Spain by the Florida treaty of 1819, embraced all the country now claimed by the State of Texas between the Neuces and the Rio Grande.

He then repeats the Acts of Texas with reference to their boundaries; stating that "during a period of more than nine years, which intervened between the adoption of her constitution and her annexation as one of the States of our Union, Texas asserted and exercised many acts of sovereignty and jurisdiction over the territory and inhabitants west of the Neuces, such as organizing and defining limits of counties extending to the Rio Grande; establishing courts of justice, and extending her judicial system over the territory; establishing also a custom-house, post offices, a land-office," &c.

The President designates by the name of *Texas*, the cession of Louisiana by France to the United States; and he again calls the territory ceded to Spain by the Florida treaty of 1819, *the Texas*. He intimates that the claim of the United States to the territory between the Sabine and the Rio del Norte was derived from the boundaries of Texas, and that by claiming as far west as the river, the United States did recognize that it was the boundary of *the Texas*. I really do not understand what is meant by this assertion.

The United States claimed the Rio Norte as being the legitimate boundary of *Louisiana*, and not of Texas. Neither they nor France had ever been in possession of the country beyond the Sabine. Spain had always held possession, and had divided the territory into provinces as she pleased. One of these was called Texas, and its boundaries had been designated and altered at her will. With these the United States had no concern. If their claim could be sustained, it must be by proving that Louisiana extended of right thus far. This had no connection with the boundaries which Spain might have assigned to her province of Texas. These might have extended beyond the del Norte, or have been east of the Rio Nueces. There is not the slightest connection between the legitimate boundaries of Louisiana and those of the Spanish province of Texas. The presumed identity is a mere supposition.

It is not necessary to discuss the soundness of the pretensions to the Rio Norte, asserted by Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Monroe, since they were yielded in exchange of Florida and some other objects by the treaty of 1819; a treaty extremely popular at the time, and the execution of which was pressed with great zeal and perseverance.

Whenever ultimately ceded to Mexico that Republic fixed its boundaries as it thought proper. Texas and Coahuila were declared to form a State; and the Rio Nueces was made the boundary of Texas. When Texas declared itself independent, it was the insurrection of only part of a State, for Coahuila remained united to Mexico. But the Rio Nueces was the boundary between the department of Texas and the State of Tamaulipas. The whole contested territory lies within the limits of Tamaulipas, which never was, under the Mexican Government, connected in any shape with Texas.

The question now under consideration is only that between the United States and Mexico; and in that view of the subject, it is quite immaterial whether the acts of the United States emanated from Congress or from the Executive. No act of either, recognizing the territory beyond the Nueces as a part of the territory of the United States, can be alleged against Mexico, as a proof of their right to the country thus claimed. Any such act is only an assertion, a declaration, but not an argument sustaining the right. It is, however, proper to observe here, that the port of delivery west of the Nueces, erected by the act of Congress, "To establish a collection district in the State of Texas," was at Corpus Christi, a place which was in the actual possession of the State.

It must also be premised that, in the joint resolution for the annexation of Texas, the question of the boundary between it and Mexico was expressly reserved as one which should be settled by treaty between the United States and Mexico.

The only arguments in the President's Message which sustain the right of Texas to territory beyond the Nueces, are contained in those passages in which it is asserted, that the jurisdiction of Texas has been extended and exercised beyond the Nueces: that the country between that river and the del Norte had been represented in the Congress and Convention of Texas, had taken part in the annexation itself, and was now included within one of our Congressional districts.

But it is not stated in the President's Message, how far beyond the Nueces the jurisdiction of Texas had been extended, nor what part of the country between that river and the del Norte had been represented in the Congress and the Convention of Texas, and was then included within one of our Congressional districts.

Now the actual jurisdiction beyond the Nueces never extended farther than the adjacent settlement of San Patricio, consisting of about twenty families. That small district, though beyond the Nueces, was contiguous to and in the actual possession of Texas. On this account it might be rightfully included within the limits which we were bound to protect against Mexican invasion.

But what was the country between this small settlement of San Patricio, or between Corpus Christi and the Rio del Norte, over which it might be supposed the jurisdiction of Texas had been extended, so as to be included within one of our Congressional districts? Here again, Texas had erected that small settlement into a county called San Patricio, and declared that this county extended to the Rio del Norte. This, like all other declaratory acts of the same kind, was only an assertion not affecting the question of right. The State of Texas might, with equal propriety, have declared that their boundary extended to the Sierra Madre, or to the Pacific. The true question of right to any territory beyond the Mexican limits of the Department of Texas depends on the facts: By whom was the territory in question actually inhabited and occupied? and had the inhabitants united with Texas in the insurrection against Mexico? The whole country beyond the settlement of San Patricio and Corpus Christi, till within a few miles of the del Norte, is a perfect desert, 160 miles wide by the route pursued by Gen. Taylor, as stated by himself, and near 120 miles in a straight line.

The only settled part of it is along the left bank of the del Norte, and but a few miles in breadth. This belt was settled, inhabited, and occupied exclusively by Mexicans. It included the town of Loredo; and Mexico had a custom-house at Brazos, north of the mouth of the river. Till occupied by the American arms it had ever been, and was at the time when invaded by Gen. Taylor, a part of the Department of Tamaulipas, and subject to the jurisdiction of the Prefect of the Northern District of that Department.

In the course of the war between Mexico and Texas, incursions had been occasionally made by each party into the territories of the other. A Mexican officer had, once or twice, obtained temporary occupation of San Antonio, within the limits of Texas; and the Texans had, on one occasion, taken Loredo itself, and more than once had carried their arms not only to the left bank of the del Norte, but even beyond that river. In both cases the aggressive parties had been repulsed and expelled. The last Texan expedition of that kind took place in December, 1842, and terminated in their defeat at Mier.

That the country adjacent to the left bank of the river was exclusively in the possession of Mexicans was well known to our Government.

When General Taylor marched to the del Norte, he issued an order, (No. 30,) translated into the Spanish, ordering all under his command to observe with the most scrupulous respect the rights of all the inhabitants, who might be found in peaceful prosecution of their respective occupations, as well on the left as on the right side of the Rio Grande. No interference, he adds, will be allowed with the civil rights or religious privileges of the inhabitants.

In June, 1845, General Taylor had been directed to select and occupy, on or near the Rio Grande del Norte, such a site as would be best adapted to repel invasion and to protect our Western border. But on the 8th of July following, the Secretary of War (Mr. Marcy) addressed the following letter to him:

"This Department is informed that Mexico has some military establishments on the east side of the Rio Grande, which are, and for some time have been, in the actual occupancy of her troops. In carrying out the instructions heretofore received, you will be careful to avoid any acts of aggression unless an actual state of war should exist. The Mexican forces at the posts in their possession, and which have been so, will not be disturbed as long as the relations of peace between the United States and Mexico continue."

On the 30th July, 1845, the Secretary again addresses General Taylor as follows: "You are expected to occupy, protect, and defend, the territory of Texas, to the extent that it has been occupied by the people of Texas. The Rio Grande is claimed to be the boundary between the two countries, and up to this boundary you are to extend your protection, only *excepting* any posts on the eastern side thereof, which are in the actual occupancy of Mexican forces, or *Mexican settlements* over which the Republic of Texas did not exercise jurisdiction at the period of annexation, or shortly before that event. It is expected, in selecting the establishment for your troops, you will approach as near the boundary line, the Rio Grande, as prudence will dictate. With this view the President desires that your position, for a part of your forces at least, should be west of the river Nueces."

The Mexican settlements, thus excepted, are not those over which Texas did not claim jurisdiction, but those on the East bank of the Rio Grande over which Texas did not *exercise* jurisdiction at the period mentioned.—The President had no authority to give up the boundary claimed by Texas: but it is clear that at that time, when war was not contemplated, the Administration was of opinion that, till the question was definitely settled, the occupancy by the Mexicans of the territory adjacent to the left bank of the del Norte ought not to be disturbed. Neither the subsequent refusal by Mexico to receive a residing Envoy, nor the successes of the American arms have affected the question of right. The claim of Texas, whether to New Mexico or to the lower portion of the Rio del Norte, was identically the same, as invalid and groundless in one case as in the other. Why a distinction has been made by the Executive has not been stated. The fact is that he has established a temporary Government for New Mexico, as a country conquered, and without any regard to the claim of Texas; while, on the other hand, he has permitted that State to extend its jurisdiction over the country lying on the left bank of the del Norte, which, like New Mexico, had been conquered by the arms of the United States. Not a shadow of proof has been adduced to sustain the pretensions of Texas to that district; and justice imperiously requires that it should, by the treaty of peace, be restored to Mexico.

It so happens that the boundary, which may be traced in conformity with this principle, is a natural one, and that as a measure of expediency, none more eligible could have been devised. A desert of one hundred and twenty miles separates the most Southwesterly Texan settlements of Corpus Christi and San Patricio from those of the Mexicans on the left bank of the del Norte, than which no boundary could be devised better calculated to prevent collisions hereafter between the two nations. It will be sufficient, for that purpose, to draw a nominal line through the desert, leaving all the waters that empty into the Rio Norte to Mexico, and all those that empty into the Rio Nueces to Texas, together with such other provisions, respecting fortifications and military posts, as may be necessary for the preservation of peace.

The line of the Rio Norte is one from which Mexico would be perpetually threatened, and from which their adjacent town on the eastern bank may be bombarded.—Such an intolerable nuisance would perpetuate most hostile feelings. With such a narrow river as the Rio del Norte, and with a joint right of navigation, repeated collisions would be unavoidable.

Among these, when there was nothing but a fordable river to cross, slaves would perpetually escape from Texas and where would be the remedy? Are the United States prepared to impose by a treaty on Mexico, where Slavery is unknown, the obligation to surrender fugitive slaves?

Mexico is greatly the weaker power, and requires a boundary which will give her as much security as is practicable. It is not required, either for the preservation of peace or for any other legitimate purpose, that the United States should occupy a threatening position. It cannot be rationally supposed that Mexico will ever make an aggressive war against them; and even in such case, the desert would protect them against an invasion. If a war should ever again take place between the two countries, the overwhelming superiority of the Navy of the United States will enable them to carry on their operations wherever they please. They would, within a month, re-occupy the left bank of the Rio Norte, and within a short time effect a landing and carry the war to any quarter they pleased.

Must the war be still prosecuted for an object of no intrinsic value, to which the United States have no legitimate right, which justice requires them to yield, and which even expediency does not require?

We find in the Boston Courier a report of the speech of Mr. Dwight of Springfield, in the Massachusetts House of Representatives, and take from it the following eloquent extract:

But, Mr. Speaker, I must pass to other aspects of this war question. This war is not an isolated event. It is a result of preceding events. It is the last act of a tragedy. It began in motives, and motives always active at the seat of Government. If you had not annexed Texas you would have had no war. If new territory had not been wanted for Slavery to spread itself over—if the owners of slaves had not wanted more profit from their slaves, and more power in your Government from slave representation, Texas would never have been annexed. If when Texas was annexed, the appetite of Slavery for slave territory had been sated, you would have had no war; but it was not, and you had the war. Slavery, then, and this war are connected as cause and effect. No view of the war is sound and entire which does not refer its origin to Slavery. No one can write the history of our revolution without stating the motive in which it originated—the love of liberty. No one can write the history of the Mexican war without stating the motives in which it originated—the love of Slavery—the desire to extend Slavery—the desire to have more profit on property in slaves—the desire to have more political power from slave representation in Congress. No one doubts that Texas was annexed to preserve and perpetuate the domestic institution. Mr. Calhoun avows it, I believe in these very words. The South were almost unanimous in annexing Texas—the South are not as unanimous in the purpose of the administration of annexing the Californias and New Mexico, and perhaps all Mexico. This is true. Hence some say we misrepresent the Government when we charge it with a desire to extend Slavery by this war. But I think the charge must stand. South Carolina was eager for all Texas, and is not eager with the administration for all the Californias and New Mexico. But Mr. Calhoun says we must have some territorial indemnity. Mr. Butler says none of the territory which the administration proposes to acquire is fit for slave labour, which lies north of 32 degrees. Under these circumstances, mark the instincts of Slavery. South Carolina hesitates because a portion of the territory the administration propose to acquire, may be free territory; and if the North is true to the Wilmot proviso, all would be free territory, and South Carolina does not want free territory on our southern frontier. South Carolina would therefore call off the too eager hounds of the administration, and only take some territory, and that, I doubt not, south of 32. But the spirit of acquiring slave territory is up, and will not regulate itself by the nice discrimination of South Carolina. The administration are borne on by its impulses, and seek territory, resisting the Wilmot proviso. Slavery having stretched its huge length over Texas, seeks to extend itself full many a rood over Mexico; and some in defiance of South Carolina's doubt, contend, that if Slavery can master North Carolina and Kentucky, it can live in any part of Mexico.

Governor Smith, of Virginia, says Slavery must have new fields of emigration, when it has worn out the old. This, then, is our position: We not only seek our neighbour's land in the spirit of conquest, but we seek it that we may open new markets for human flesh: that the lash of the overseer may sound in fields unwonted to the slave's toil. Is there deeper infamy than this?—Was not the cup of national infamy filled to the brim, in the partition of Poland, in the subjugation of India—must it overflow on our land in darker stains than are found on Russia's or England's banner? It is even so.

But this is not all the truth respecting this war. If it is a war to acquire slave territory, it is a war to strengthen the slave power in the country, to increase the slave representaion in Congress; then it is virtually a war against the free states. The war has two sides; it is Janus-faced. Its objects are conquest abroad, and control at home. Contentions for political power are commonly carried on in calm debate, by the tactics of politicans: but Slavery wages war afar off in the deserts of Mexico, and there robs the free states of their power. Our blood bounded at our victories on the Rio Grande; we became part and parcel in the heroism of Taylor at Buena Vista; we shared Scott's gallantry in his advance on Mexico, but we forget ourselves. Mexican power was indeed stricken down on these fields, but the power of the free States, I fear fell with it.

Mr. Speaker, I rejoice that a spirit of fanaticism, as it is called, on the subject of Slavery, has sprung up at the North. I rejoice that it has infected the Whig party, as it is said to have done. I rejoice because it has purged the moral vision of the North, and enabled it to see the encroachments and enormities of Slavery; enabled it to see the monster casting his dark shadow, not only over the sunny fields of the South, but over halls of legislation, over cabinets, over battle-fields—over-shadowing the interests, the rights, the power, the minds, and hearts of the free States. I rejoice, that since the South combines for Slavery, the North at length combines for Freedom. I rejoice, that a cry of no more slave territory has risen and found a response in the remotest bounds of the free States. I rejoice, that in the contest between freedom and Slavery, Massachusetts leads the van. I rejoice in these things, not because the contest with Slavery is pleasant, but with wise foresight, because I love this Union as my country, and because I desire to continue to love this Union as my country. But, Sir, if Slavery is to govern in your legislative halls, is to preside in your cabinets, is to make the policy of the nation subserve its interests—if Slavery, not content with striking down the right of petition, not content with imprisoning free coloured citizens in Southern ports, not content with the law for the arrest of fugitive slaves in free States, not content with prostrating the policy of protecting our own industry—levies war, wastes treasure, spills blood, to acquire slave territory, how long shall we rejoice in the sentiment—"The Union now and forever, one and indissoluble?" How long before the rust of Slavery will eat out the chain of your Union? I hope long, but I fear.

From the North Star.

ADDRESS

Of the Executive Committee of the Western New York Anti-Slavery Society to the Abolitionists of Western New York.

We address you as friends and fellow-labourers in a great and noble cause, as those who strive in practice "to remember those in bonds as bound with them." Our earnest hope is, that our words may fall on good ground, even upon the hearts of the true friends of the oppressed, and that rich fruit of good works may spring up—persevering effort, ceaseless energy, uncompromising fidelity, and noble self-sacrifice. We have to contend with powerful and deep-rooted influences. Slavery in this land is no creature of a day; but, for more than two hundred years, has been strengthening its terrible power, and spreading its rule wider and deeper, until the Government, the politics, the religion, the literature, and even the social habits of the people, have become subject to its almost omnipotent sway.

By the solemn guarantees of the Constitution of the United States, the force of the nation is pledged to suppress the slave insurrection. The whole country is made a hunting ground for the hunters of men;* and the slaveholder is entitled to additional political power in Congress, by means of the three-fifths representation. Thus are the whole nation, holding three millions of human beings, in bondage; thus are the Northern people giving that support to Slavery, without which it could not for a single year, nay, scarce for a day exist; and yet, the great mass of the people are either prepared to fulfil these guarantees to the fulness of the spirit, and the exactness of the letter, or else ignorant of their terrible import, and giving them a blind, but yet, effectual support.

With here and there an exception so rare, as to make good the rule, the pulpit is dumb in regard to this great national sin. The Presbyterians and Baptists renew their fellowship, and keep bright the chain of concord, clasping fondly its links wet with the blood of the poor victims of their Southern brethren in the Lord. The Episcopal Methodists falsely claim to be free from the guilty brotherhood, while slaveholders, and even slave traders, who coin gold from the tears of mothers, kneel at their communion tables; yet there are signs that the voices of the true-hearted, are sending dismay amid the Pharisees of the nineteenth century. The startling cry of "No Union with Slaveholders," is heard, and its echoes rise amid the warm debates on this "vexed question," in the Synods and Conferences, where the leaders in the modern Israel convene. When the Church shall cease to lend the immense weight of its influence "to sanction robbery, and crime, and blood," then, and not until then, ought we to cease our warning and rebuke.

The great political organizations are, as ever, servile, false, and hollow-hearted. United with slaveholders, their course must ever be one of miserable subserviency to the slaveocracy, or still more miserable and wholly useless compromise between Slavery and Freedom, by which the people will be deceived. Freedom never gained a foot of ground, but lose all by treachery and false heartedness. Slavery is lawless. It has annexed foreign territory, declared war, engaged this guilty nation in a career of rapine and robbery, and trampled upon all laws, human and divine, that stand in its way; and yet, is gaining all that is necessary of men and money, to carry on its atrocious schemes. One great party giving these measures an open unblushing support, defending their rightfulness and legality; another crying out "illegal," "unconstitutional," and yet granting money—the "sinews of war"—because it dare not do otherwise; the leaders caring less for humanity, nay, less for their own abused and injured manhood, than for the favour and alliance of the pimps of Slavery.

The Liberty party, having for its professed object to proclaim Liberty through all the land, by the magic power of the ballot-box, links itself with the other political parties, in perpetuating a Union, which has become a guilty league for the preservation of the sum of all villanies. The leading men of the party assembled in National Convention at Buffalo, but a few weeks, since dared not declare in a public resolution, as many had done at home, that the Constitution of the United States was an Anti-Slavery document, forced by paltry considerations of political expediency to be silent, as a party in regard to what they deemed of great importance as individuals.

Such a miserable course is no matter of surprise to us, for it only shows that a great moral enterprise must inevitably become corrupted by being merged in the struggles of a political party, tending, as every such party must in this country, to compromise and corruption. We rely not upon such measures. Our firm trust is in the power of Truth, spoken without concealment or compromise. Our wish, our hope, our expectation is, to regenerate the corrupt heart of the nation. Our motto is, "No Union with Slaveholders," national, political, or ecclesiastical. We know that the Union is the bond that holds three million slaves. We know that so long as the people of the free States uphold the weak arm of the slaveholder, as they must; or so long as they maintain this Union, that oppression will rule, and the blood of the oppressed will be upon the heads of the whole people. You are as well aware of these things as we can be; therefore we ask you to join us, and demand, in the name of God and humanity, a peaceable dissolution of the Union, trusting that the guilty oppressor would tremble at his weakness and give freedom to the slave, rather than consent to dissolution, and try to hold the strong-handed bondman without the aid of the Northern arm. Knowing that if the South chose to make the hazardous experiment, the days of a slaveholding confederacy would soon be numbered. Knowing too, full well, as you all must know, that the Union is a bitter mockery, a coalition in which Slavery *gains*, and Freedom *loses* all, which must soon inevitably perish by its own wickedness.

Our great desire is, to spread light through the land; for we believe that when the people see clearly how the nation is pledged to support the infernal system; when they learn that so long as the vain and futile effort is made to perpetuate Freedom and Slavery together, that Slavery must rule with a rod of iron; and last, though not least, when they begin to appreciate the depth of woe, and misery, and degradation, the wants, the groans, the scourgings, the dehumanizing, brutalizing influences, the horrible licentiousness which are, not the abuses, but the necessary and inevitable accompaniments of American Slavery, a burst of generous indignation will be heard, the slaveholder looked upon as the lowest, the most degraded, among men, and all support, all fellowship denied him. Is not the work a good one? Is it not worth labour, long and unwearied—sacrifices constant and abundant?

We are about to open an Anti-Slavery office in this city, where a supply of valuable Anti-Slavery works will be kept for sale, and a variety of Anti-Slavery newspapers, *free* for the perusal of all, where our friends from the surrounding country can gain information in regard to the progress of our cause, and supply themselves with books and pamphlets.

We hail the establishment of the North Star in this city—a new and ably-conducted Anti-Slavery paper, edited by Frederick Douglass and M. R. Delany—as a powerful aid to our cause, and earnestly hope its circulation may be extensive.

We would also commend the National Anti-Slavery Standard, the official organ of the American Anti-Slavery Society, published in New York; the Liberator of Boston, edited by Wm. Lloyd Garrison, the fearless pioneer of our cause; the Pennsylvania Freeman, in Philadelphia; and the Anti-Slavery Bugle, in Salem, Ohio, as papers holding up a right standard, and promulgating true principles and measures.

We wish to send lecturing agents through Western New York, who shall spread Anti-Slavery intelligence, obtain subscribers for the North Star, address the people, and stir them up to new vigour in the work. Jos. C. Hathaway and Chas. L. Remond are already engaged for the coming year. J. C. Hathaway, a resident in this vicinity, is known as a well-tried Abolitionist, a man of high ability. He is appointed the General Agent of our Society. C. L. Redmond, of Salem, Massachusetts, is one who has always been faithful and active in the work. "A noble man with sable brow." His withering rebuke and touching narratives of the wicked prejudice against his race, have stung many a guilty conscience, and called the tear to many an eye.

The field is wide, and we wish to sustain both of these efficient labourers, and others, if possible. Let us rouse to a full sense of our great responsibility. Let us remember that the heart of the slave leaps with joy when we are acting, and sinks in deep despair when we are idle. Now especially is the time for strong, earnest effort. A bloody war of conquest is raging—a war to open new marts were self-styled Democrats can sell their human chattels. The groans of wounded men, the shrieks of violated women, the roar of deadly cannonade, the rattle of musketry, and the fiendish shouts of the trained bands of hireling murderers, employed by this wicked Union to do Slavery's work, rise up from the desolated valleys of Mexico. The people shout loud praises to the leaders in this horrid crusade. Let us, too, be up and doing; not with the blood-stained sword, or gory bayonet. No; nobler, *mightier* weapons are ours, even the "mild arms of Truth and Love, mad-mighty by the living God." Shall we have your earnest aid and co-operation to carry out the objects we contemplate?

We rely upon it. Our agents must be supported. We rely upon you to do it. They are efficient, self-sacrificing, and ably furnished for the work. Our Anti-Slavery office must be kept open. To do all this work, money is absolutely necessary. Will you, can you, withhold it?

We ask you, as those who are ready to do all possible for the sighing of the poor and needy, for the deliverance of yourselves and your friends from the yoke of a relentless slaveholding oligarchy, to contribute liberally according to your several abilities, to give joyfully, earnestly, as a matter of mingled pleasure and duty. All contributions we would ask to be handed in as soon as possible, to Henry Bush, No 34, Exchange street, in this city, Treasurer to the Society, or left at our Anti-Slavery office, No. 25, Buffalo street, second story, under the office of the North Star.

We close by asking you, one and all, men and women, to rebuke the sin of Slavery, and scatter the truth by fireside and field side.

Ours is a glorious warfare. Ours will be a great and glorious victory, if we will but *persevere to the end*. God and truth are with us. Our strength is in fidelity to our great principles. In the words of one of the poets of humanity—

"Prayer-strengthened for the trial, come together;
Put on your harness for the *moral* fight,
And with the blessing of your Heavenly Father,
MAINTAIN THE RIGHT!"

Signed on behalf of the Committee,
GILES B. STEBBINS,
Cor. Sec.

ROCHESTER, Feb. 22d, 1848.

A correspondent of the Christian Contributor, writing from Radnor, Pennsylvania, gives the following account of a female slave who is lecturing in that part of the country:

It appears that God is about to send forth our coloured sisters of the South to waken up the sleeping Church of the North, more particularly to the evils of Slavery in this nation. Two such, have already commenced to proclaim in trumpet language, the story of Calvary, to the lost and ruined of their race; one of them has gone to Ohio, and I had the privilege of hearing the other, as she stood up in the native dignity of womanhood with the breast-plate of a good conscience, evincing to all around her, the power and victory of that faith which overcometh the world. With an unsparing hand she deals death blows against that unnatural system which has taken such deep root in this Republic, and whose poisonous roots are entwined around the very altars of a Christian nation, and threatening our very existence as a free and virtuous people. The testimony of this sister in Christ is important. Like Rachel of old "she mourns for her children because they are not," having fallen victims together with the companion of her youth to that slave power which is devouring its millions at a meal, with the voracity of the grave, never being satiated with the blood of its victims, nor crying "it is enough." Our sister came from the eastern shore of Maryland—that State, crimsoned as it is with crime, as the voice of the martyred Torrey's blood cries to Heaven from the dark, dank dungeon of their State prison. Her name is Aurelia Howard, she was acquainted with Frederick Douglass' former master, Lloyd, and corroborates all that noble man has said about Slavery and religion in the South. It appears she prayed to the Lord from that "belly of hell," and he heard her supplications, "by taking her up out of the horrible pit and miry clay, of sin, pollution, and Slavery, and set her upon the Rock of Ages, and put a *new song* into her mouth, even praises unto our God."

In answer to the prayer of faith, God influenced her master to give her, voluntarily, her liberty, and like Miriam of old, she now can say, "sing ye to the Lord, for he has triumphed gloriously," with Hannah, the handmaid of Jehovah—"My heart rejoiceth in the Lord; mine horn is exalted in the Lord; my mouth is enlarged over mine enemies, because I rejoice in thy salvation." "There is none holy as the Lord, for there is none beside thee, neither is there any rock like unto our God."

The subject which she chose and from which she drew tears from many eyes, for the house was crowded to overflowing, was, "The woman of Canaan"—"Lord help me." As she read distinctly and audibly to the assembly the history of her subject, and proceeded to show what difficulties are thrown in the way of the poor bondmen and bondwomen to prevent their coming to Christ, I could but wish, that the sceptical and unbelieving—with regard to the crushed, scattered, and peeled sons and daughters of Cush, had been there. I think their doubts would have vanished as darkness flies before the morning light of Heaven.

I had the privilege of conversing with her personally, and do rejoice that I can join my testimony with hers, in saying: "godliness is profitable unto all things, having the promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come."

Her former master has sent for her to return to the place of her early suffering (probably out of curiosity) to hear her preach, and I pray God it may be indeed a "nail fastened in a sure place,"—after spending a short time there, she is designing to return to the free States, and desires to go out as a herald of salvation to Haiti.

I regard her as a remarkable woman, about forty-five years of age, "full of faith and of the Holy Ghost."—May Heaven raise up scores and thousands such, to go forth as messengers of truth, to those ready to perish.

From the Buffalo Commercial Advertiser.

AN INTERESTING SLAVE CASE.

Christopher Webb vs. *Jacob Emerick*:—This was an action in the Erie Court, F. P. Stevens presiding, for assault and battery and false imprisonment, brought by plaintiff against defendant, one of our City Police constables.

The trial of this cause commenced on the 21st instant, and closed on the evening of the 23d—the Court not being in session on the 22d.

The circumstances that led to this case, as appeared in evidence, are peculiar and novel. In the latter part of September last, two large athletic men, one by the name of Perry, the other Wolf, slave dealers in Kentucky, made their appearance in our city in search of a negro who they said was a runaway slave. While prowling about the city in search of their game, they learned that a negro bearing the description of the one they were in search of was then engaged at work in the upper part of the Gothic Hall.

Anxious to ascertain the feeling of our republican city, and how far they might proceed to the securing of their prey, they applied to the defendant, who, upon the representations made to him, consented to assist them in the prosecution of their designs. The necessary plans to their success being consumated, they proceeded to the Gothic Hall to secure the plaintiff. The two slave dealers entered the upper part of the Hall, where the plaintiff was engaged at work, seized hold of him, as though he had been guilty of the highest crime known to our laws, and, without giving him time to put on his hat, cravat, or boots, thrust him out therefrom, down a dark pair of stairs, where they were joined by defendant.

By this time the news of the capture of plaintiff drew together an assemblage of people of all colours. The slave dealers were here inquired of by what right or authority they arrested the plaintiff, but no answer was given, upon which the youngest of the two drew from his side a six-barreled revolving pistol, and said that he would "blow through" the first man who interfered.—His courage, however, soon become a little cooled by the interposition of one or two who told him that our laws and the rights of our citizens should be protected—explained the nature of the offence he had committed by the display of the pistol—and that by the words accompanying that act he had subjected himself to imprisonment

Yet determined to secure plaintiff, and against all expostulations, they forced him down another flight of stairs to Main street, and thence up some other stairs to a back office. As soon as the plaintiff was thrust into the office the door was closed, but was soon made open again by the crowd that followed. Here the release of plaintiff was demanded by several persons, who told him to leave as neither the slave dealers nor the defendant had any right to detain him. The plaintiff started, but was seized hold of again by the defendant and thrown back, defendant placing himself at the door to prevent his going out. At this last act for the further subjugation of the plaintiff the crowd became so much excited that proposals of reconciliation were offered by the friends of the slave dealers, and the plaintiff was allowed to pass out without molestation.

On the defence an attempt was made to establish the fact that the defendant acted from good motives—and that all he did and said was to quiet the row produced by the seizure of plaintiff which was his duty to do as an officer. Here the cause ended. After a charge from the Judge the Jury retired with instructions to seal their verdict, and present it at the going in of the Court the next morning, when— to-day the verdict of the Jury was received, finding for plaintiff $9.

The Anti-Slavery Standard.

NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 1848.

Massachusetts Quarterly Review, No. 2, March, 1848.

We have received the second number of the above, filled, like its predecessor, with articles of varied interest: The Legal Basis of Slavery; Mill's Logic; Education; Hebrew Monarchy; Ballad Literature, &c. &c.

To the first we must give a few words. The introductory remarks are well written, but betray occasionally that the writer is groping among principles whose relations he does not accurately understand—a matter, however, of little consequence, since this portion of the article has no bearing upon what follows. In fact, it is an introduction that leads to nothing. The historical sketch of Slavery, and of Colonial Legislation on the subject, is correct in the main, though, unhappily, erroneous as to those precise points upon which the Reviewer subsequently rests all his reasoning. The argument is this. After showing that the several Colonies had established and regulated Slavery by precise legislation, the Reviewer asks, "Was this legislation valid?" He answers. No. Because;

First, Such laws were contrary to the provisions of the Colonial Charters.

Unfortunately THERE WERE NO CHARTERS in existence in the most important slave colonies, Virginia, Carolina, and Georgia, at the time their slave laws were enacted. That of Virginia ceased in 1624. Her slave laws bear date 1677, 1670 1705, 1753. The Charter of Carolina, North and South, was surrendered, 1729. Her great slave statute is dated 1740. The Georgia Charter ceased 1751. Her slave law was passed 1770.

Secondly, The Reviewer tells us, that where there were no Charters, such laws, being contrary to the Common Law of England, were null and void.

But Common Law may be at any time changed or over-ruled by statute. No court ever considered an Act of Parliament void because it was contrary to the Common Law. Parliament has the right to change and over-rule the Common Law; and many of its acts are passed for this very purpose. Every lawyer knows this; and every American, who undertakes to write upon this subject, ought to know that the statutes of a Colonial Assembly, so far as the internal affairs of the Colony are concerned, were, when ratified by the King, precisely equivalent to an Act of Parliament in England.

As Massachusetts men used to say in 1692, "The General Court has, with the King's approbation, as much power in New England, as the King and Parliament have in England." Or, in the solemn language of the Continental Congress of 1774, "As the English Colonists are not represented, and from their local and other circumstances, cannot properly be represented in the British Parliament, they are entitled to a *free and exclusive power of legislation* in their several provincial Legislatures, (where their right of Representation can alone be preserved,) in all cases of taxation and *internal polity, subject only* to the negative of their Sovereign," &c. &c.

Colonial Legislation void because contrary to the common Law of England! Why, our fathers changed the common Law, the very first thing they did on their landing. The Laws of descent, for instance, were wholly different in many of the Colonies from the Common Law.

Judge Story says (Comm. i. 148), "Notwithstanding the cautious reference in the Charters to the laws of England, the assemblies *actually exercised the authority to abrogate every part of the Common Law*, except that which united the Colonies to the parent State by the general ties of allegiance and dependency."

Where there were no Charters the Colonists were not bound to pay any regard, in their legislation, to the Common Law. To be sure they claimed its privileges as their right, but they never allowed themselves to be bound by it, any further than they pleased. Where there were Charters provision was usually made in them, that these laws of the Colonies should be consonant *as near as conveniently could be*, to the laws of England. To secure the observance of this proviso, the King, in these Charters, usually retained to himself a veto on all their laws. In Provinces without a Charter, he always had, of course such a veto. When therefore the King had once ratified a law, that ratification was conclusive proof that such laws were not thought *contrary to the laws of England by the only power that had a right to judge*. English courts had nothing to do with this question.

The case in South Carolina, which the Reviewer quotes to prove a contrary doctrine, when *accurately stated*, sustains our position. South Carolina had passed a law which the Dissenters disliked. The acts of the Colonial Assembly were valid until disallowed by the King.—Where, in such case, did the Dissenters go? To the Courts to overrule the law as being contrary to the Common Law, as the Reviewer supposes? No. To Parliament, to overrule it? No. They went to the House of Lords, and asked them to *request Her Majesty* not to ratify the law. The Peers passed a *resolve* to that effect. Just as a Massachusetts Legislature *resolve* about the abolition of Slavery, in the District of Columbia; having *no legal authority* in the matter. Neither had the Peers. Her Majesty Queen Anne, listened to their requests and the propositions not being ratified, did not remain a law. We should delight to get rid of Slavery, but are not willing in order to do so, to accept a doctrine which our fathers regarded as Slavery, namely, that every English Court or Parliament itself, had a right to overrule the laws of a free colony, when once ratified by the

ton in the Cambria, on the 4th of April, in which manner he had engaged and paid for a cabin passage. Almost at the moment of sailing, however, he was informed that his berth was given to another, and that he could not be allowed to proceed in the vessel, except on condition of exclusion from an equality of privileges with the other passengers. Mr. Douglass was compelled by the shortness of time for consultation and consideration, to submit to these terms; although there is no doubt that he could have recovered exemplary damages of the Company, had he been able and disposed to remain for the purpose of prosecuting a suit at law. He addressed a letter, however, stating the facts, to the Liverpool Mercury, which called forth a loud and unequivocal burst of indignation from almost every part of Great Britain—from the London Times, downwards. The effect of this expression of opinion was a public communication from Mr. Cunard himself, disclaiming the proceedings of his agents, and pledging himself that a like occurrence should never happen again. The captain of the Cambria did everything in his power to make Mr. Douglass's passage agreeable, resigning his own state room for his accommodation; and he met with much attention from many of his fellow-passengers. But this was, after all, only gilding the chains which the Company's agents had fastened upon his limbs, in compliance with the base and cruel prejudice of their American customers.

Mr. Douglass was joyfully welcomed by his many friends in this country upon his arrival. On the 23d of April, a Reception Meeting was held at the Lyceum Hall, in Lynn, his place of residence at that time, which was addressed by Messrs. Garrison and Buffum, as well as by Mr. Douglass. On the evening of May 3d, a great Meeting of Welcome was held in the Belknap Street Church, which gave Mr. Douglass an enthusiastic reception. It was addressed by the Chairman, Mr. Nell, Mr. Garrison, Mr. Wendell Phillips, and several other gentlemen, and had the greatest possible success. Subsequently, at the time of the Annual Meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Society, at New York, there was a meeting of the coloured people held for the same purpose, which was in the highest degree animated and enthusiastic.

Mr. Douglass was not permitted to leave England without substantial proofs of the regard of his English friends. The circumstance that he was still, in the eye of American law, a slave, for whom there was no city of refuge on the American soil, suggested to some of them the fitness of their sueing out his patent of American citizenship, by paying the price of his head. A negotiation was accordingly entered into with his owner, and he was redeemed from his captivity. This transaction has raised questions both as to its propriety and expediency, among the best friends of Mr. Douglass, and of the slave, into which we do not propose to enter. But no one can question the benevolent spirit which prompted this measure, on the part of the British Abolitionists. Besides this instance of their liberality, however, a sum of money amounting to nearly £500, was raised for the purpose of purchasing a press and types to enable Mr. Douglass to establish a newspaper, as the organ of the coloured people. Upon consultation with his friends here, however, he decided on abandoning, or postponing, this plan; and the amount contributed, was remitted in money. But on accompanying Mr. Garrison in his tour to Ohio, of which we shall presently speak, he found a state of things existing which seemed to him to warrant the experiment. He has, accordingly, established himself at Rochester, N. Y., and commenced the publication of the North Star, with the beginning of the present year.

Although it is a question upon which his friends will continue to entertain different opinions, whether or not this is the way in which the great talents of Mr. Douglass may be best exerted for the redemption of the slave; still it can be no question whether a newspaper conducted with the ability which will be sure to mark the North Star, and informed by the uncompromising spirit of hostility to pro-slavery, in Church and in State, whether it assume the name and shape of Anti-Slavery, or appear in its own proper garb, can fail to be a potent instrumentality for good. His services must be great and important, be they rendered in what shape they may, and his influence cannot but be widely felt, let it be put forth in whatever direction he may think best. We shall heartily regret, in common with all his other personal and Anti-Slavery friends, in New England, his removal to so great a distance. But we shall endeavour to check whatever is selfish in this feeling, by the recollection that the field of such a reaper is the world, and that, be he where he may, he must needs find, or make a harvest. He will be followed to his new home, and his new sphere of usefulness, by the ardent good wishes and the confident hopes of his many friends, in this his first home of freedom. We believe that they will all be glad to do what they may to further his plans, and to make them as successful as he can desire. It will ever rejoice their hearts to hear of his usefulness and prosperity. And it will be their unanimous wish and hope that this change of abode and variation of pursuit, may be in the highest degree conducive to the one and to the other.

POLITICAL PARTIES.

The last year has been one of no little ferment in the political parties which divide among themselves the citizens of this Republic. The approach of the time when another President is to be made has had the usual effect of making the Political cauldron seethe and bubble, and the usual agitation of the scum which naturally rises to its surface. Neither of the great parties has, as yet, selected the man whom it would choose to reign over us, when the days of Mr. Polk are numbered. But the manœuvres of both, preliminary to the impending campaign, sufficiently indicate the character of the tactics by which its results will be determined. The potential voice of the slave power must be listened to by both. Neither is ready to take a stand which might make it independent of that supreme influence.—They will still vie in their endeavours, each with the other, to secure the support, which, in the present organization of parties, can alone give them the victory. It is only over the prostrate body of the slave that either can hope to reach the high places of power and patronage.

Though no regular nominations have been made, there has been no lack of aspirants to the chair of State. General Taylor, Mr. Clay, General Cass, Mr. Calhoun, Mr. Benton, Mr. Corwin, Mr. Webster, Judge Woodbury, and other politicians have been put forward by State Legislatures, Party Conventions, or individual nomination, as suitable incumbents of that high position. The Mexican War has been, in effect, but a preparatory skirmish which is to usher in this grand battle. Both parties, and all candidates are striving so to use it as to make it ancillary to their own objects. And there is no reason to hope, that either, or any, will be scrupulous as to the attitude they assume in this regard, so it will improve their chances for success. No considerable body of men is ready to risk the prospects of the parties with which they are identified, by making a decided stand against the shedding of our brother's blood, or the plunder of his lands for the purposes of Slavery. Vague and general declarations there are enough, and there is an honourable minority of both parties determined to be faithful in this behalf, but a resolute purpose, pervading any considerable portion of either, to hazard all upon the stake of Liberty or Slavery, is nowhere to be discerned.

Last September, the Whigs of Massachusetts held a Convention at Springfield, for the ostensible purpose of selecting a candidate for Governor of the State; but really, on the part of the leading influences in it, for the recommendation of Mr. Webster to the National Convention, as the Whig candidate for the Presidency. In order to secure this object, the pro-slavery majority were willing to yield minor points which they had insultingly refused the last year to the Anti-Slavery minority, and even to pass resolutions equivalent to those which they had then scouted from Faneuil Hall. In addition to these concessions, Mr. Webster himself was brought forward, and made a speech as satisfactory to the minority as he could well make it. In the excitement caused by this speech the resolutions came up for action. Mr. Palfrey moved as an amendment, "that the Whigs of Massachusetts, will support no man for the offices of President or Vice President, but those who are known by their acts or declared opinions to be opposed to the extension of Slavery."—This amendment Mr. Winthrop opposed on the ground, that the Whig party might have to choose between an extension candidate and defeat! This action on his part, secured him the Speaker's Chair, the acknowledgment of Mr. Holmes, of Charlesion, S. C. who, by declining to vote, decided that contest. The amendment, however, was pronounced to be lost, by a very doubtful vote, and then the resolutions, concluding with the recommendation of Mr. Webster, passed without opposition. Thus anomalous is the position of the Whigs of Massachusetts, that while they denounce the war and its objects, in the strongest terms, and select as their candidate a man who had just committed himself in the fullest manner to the same opinions, they refuse to engage to be faithful to their opinions, and their choice, when they come to be submitted to the ordeal of a National Convention.

The history of the third political party, during the last year, deserves a passing notice, since it is probable that this will be the last time that we shall have occasion to mention it. Early in the summer, a Convention was held at Macedon Lock' New York, composed of persons usually acting with the Third party, who erected themselves into a Fourth, by the style and title of the Liberty League. This organization distinguished itself from that from which it was a secession, by the addition of *eighteen* articles to the *one* which constituted the creed of the latter. It nominated Messrs. Gerrit Smith and Elihu Burritt as its candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency, and took such measures as seemed best to it to secure their election. It rested upon the perception of the philosophical absurdity of attempting to build up a political party to success, upon a single idea. Its fallacy lay in proposing to build one up upon *nineteen*. Whereas, no political party can hope for, or should obtain, political success, except through the confidence of the people, whether well or ill-placed, that it will provide for *all* the public interests.

In October, a Convention of the "Liberty" party was held at Buffalo, for the nomination of candidates. The leaders of the Liberty League were in attendance for the purpose of procuring, if possible, the adoption of their candidates and creed, by the Convention. The Convention, however, showed that it was too weary of the impracticable position in which the Third party had stood so long, to be disposed to exchange it for one quite as bad. Accordingly, it settled the matter by nominating John P. Hale, of New Hampshire, the candidate of the Independent Democrats of his own State, and thus, virtually merging themselves in that party. Mr. Hale had declined permitting himself to be made the nominee of the "Liberty" party, until he was in the field as the candidate of the Independent Democrats. A considerable number in the Convention were in favour of making no nomination until the great parties had made theirs, in the belief that one or the other would furnish a candidate satisfactory to all Anti-Slavery voters. And the opinion was expressed by prominent men in the party, that this was the last Presidential Convention it would ever hold. In order to avoid a collision of sentiment with their candidate on the subject of the relations of the Constitution to Slavery, the Convention had the good sense to make no claim of an Anti Slavery construction for that Instrument, and the pro-slavery character of its compromises was admitted in its resolutions and in the speeches of conspicuous members, who had long maintained the opposite absurdity of doctrine.

The political demonstrations in the State of New York, within this year, have been of a new and encouraging aspect. The Mass Convention at Herkimer, by a portion of the Democratic party, to pass censure upon the pro-slavery servility of the Regular Democratic Convention at Syracuse, was a hopeful sign of a recuperative element in the constitution of the popular mind, which had lain dormant so long that its very existence was a matter of doubt.

At the Syracuse Convention, the great State Democratic Convention for nominations, the following resolution was proposed for adoption:—

"Resolved, That while the Democracy of New York, represented in this Convention, will adhere to all the compromises of the Constitution, and maintain all the reserved rights of the State, they declare—since the crisis has arrived when that question must be met—their uncompromising hostility to the extension of Slavery into territory now free, which may be hereafter acquired, by any action of the Government of the United States."

This resolution being refused a hearing, or at least a discussion, and that in a most insolent and tyrannical manner, this Mass Convention was called to meet at Herkimer, for the purpose of expressing the sense of the Democratic party of New York, on this subject. It was summoned by no mean names in the Democratic ranks. C. C. Cambreleng, John Van Buren, and D. D. Field, were no cyphers, in themselves, and they stood for much more than they expressed, in their own proper persons.

The number of delegates was estimated at from *three to four thousand*. The rejected resolution was reiterated, adopted, and proclaimed as "an inseparable element" of the true Democratic creed. The Convention went further. It declared that "the declared determination of no inconsiderable portion of our fellow Democrats at the South to refuse to go into a General Convention, for the nomination of a candidate for the Presidency, except upon condition that opposition to the extension of Slavery into new territories be abandoned, and to refuse their suffrages to candidates to office who do not concur in such extension, makes it necessary for the Democracy of New York to declare that, if such determination is persisted in, and becomes general, they will be obliged to adopt a counter declaration, and to proclaim their determination to vote for no man, under any circumstances, who does not subscribe to the preceding resolution; and we recommend our fellow Democrats to prepare for such an emergency." If this resolution be carried into effect, it will be one of the most memorable expressions of opinion in our history. If the powerful division of the Democracy of New York, represented at the Herkimer Convention, really refuses to vote for an extension candidate, should such an one be set up by the party, (as unquestionably will be done,) and acts for Northern interests rather than for partisan supremacy, it will be a dividing wedge of no mean momentum to widen the breach, already opened, between North and South.

The grossly pro slavery-character of the political parties is proved by the necessity which it creates for these demonstrations, on the part of the Young Whigs of Massachusetts, of the Independent Democrats of New Hampshire, and the Anti-Extension Democrats of New York. They are of necessity pro-slavery, as long as they claim, as parties, a national character. The existence of Slavery in more than half of the States of the Union, and the concentration of all the political power of these States in the hands of a compact and intelligent body of slaveholders, makes compromise an essential element of any national party. And compromise is, necessarily, the triumph of the weaker and the worser part. So it is vain and absurd to expect any sustained and consistent Anti-Slavery action from any party that looks for success in co-operation with slaveholders.

The Herkimer Convention did not nominate candidates in opposition to those set up by the Syracuse Convention. It merely met to express the sense of New York Democracy in this especial matter. The Young Democracy of New York are yet in the infantile state of our own Young Whigs, who voted for Mr. Briggs, after all their reclamations. They do not, either of them, feel able to go alone as yet. We think they both made a mistake, for their own political prospects. The Young Whigs only wanted *pluck* to have had the control of Massachusetts, just as the Independent Democrats had of New Hampshire, and will have again. That section of the Democracy of New Hampshire, by throwing away the scabbard when they drew the sword, placed Mr. Hale in the Senate and Mr. Tuck in the House; and by a union with the Whigs will undoubtedly again carry the State.

But all these things are signs of somewhat yet to be revealed. A Northern party is unquestionably at hand. Like the sects of Jerusalem, the jarring parties at the North will yet unite and present a formidable front to the common enemy. The recent merging of the Third party, in its National Organization, (if it can be said to have had such,) in the Independent Democratic party, is another sign. It had already done this in New Hampshire, and has now had the good sense virtually to abandon its absurd and impracticable position, and to identify itself with a segment of one of the ruling parties. The Whigs of New Hampshire have shown themselves willing to waive minor differences, and unite with Mr. Hale and his friends, on the ground of opposition to Slavery and slave extension. This will be the *modus operandi* elsewhere. There is Anti-Slavery spirit enough in the free States to create a formidable, if not a predominant party. All that is needed is men of personal integrity and moral courage to take the lead. We think the emergency will soon arise, if it have not arisen already, to call them forth.

Congress.

We find in the National Intelligencer a speech of Mr. Giddings, in a debate, on an appropriation bill, on Monday of last week, from which we make the following extract:

He repeated, the slave party had this day declared, by a solemn vote which would go down to all coming time, that they had thirteen majority in favour of Slavery and the degradation of our race.

War was merely (Mr. G. proceeded to say) a consequence of the other question He referred to the speeches in Congress and before the people, to the resolutions of the State Legislatures, and the various expressions of public sentiment of those opposed to the annexation of Texas while that measure was pending, and said that in these this war, with its vast expenditure of blood and treasure, with all its horrid crimes—crimes of deep and damning dye—was foretold with accuracy as the result of Annexation. In this hall, from 1843 to this day, no session had passed in which gentlemen, and he among them, had not foretold the exact state of circumstances by which we were now surrounded.

He concurred in what had been so well said by his colleague, (Mr. Schenck,) that the Whig party were in some degree following in the footsteps of the majority of the Congress before us. The line of demarcation between the old parties has become dim; the policy which they adopted (said Mr. G.) we are carrying out to-day. If you say that the Whig party have the majority, and control the action of this body, you must say that we are carrying out the very plans pursued by the last Congress. The bill before the House appropriated millions on millions—for what purpose? To carry out the objects, the designs of the other side of the House, as proclaimed upon the statute-book of the last session—to appropriate moneys to maintain the war in Mexico up to the 30th of June next.

He said to the Whigs that to-day they stood here, in this respect, following in the footsteps of the opposite party. It was due, however, to his friends upon this side of the House to say that, upon this subject, he meant to cast no reflection upon them. It was their duty to take the course which their conscience dictated; and he must be governed in the same way. He would vote for all necessary supplies (and, as he had been frequently misrepresented, he wished to be distinctly understood on this point) to prevent the army in Mexico from suffering for food and raiment. He would vote all necessary appropriations to sustain them and to bring them back—he would send more forces if it was necessary for this purpose.—If any man attributed to him a want of feeling towards the officers and men who composed the army, he did him injustice. He desired to see all the appropriations made with that express and limited purpose. There he stopped. To shed the blood of these men in Mexico, to cannonade her cities, to devastate her country, to drench her soil with blood, he never could—he never would consent. Not one dollar, not one man would he ever vote to appropriate to purposes of bloodshed in a foreign country.

Reference had been made this morning to the vote upon the resolutions giving the thanks of Congress to certain of our officers who had been engaged in the recent battles in Mexico. He wished to say a word of explanation on that subject. When called upon a few days since to vote upon that question, he had at a previous time made up his mind to let it pass in silence rather than vote against his friends as well as his opponents politically, but more mature reflection had convinced him that it was his duty to express on the record his sentiments. He could not vote any thanks to those gentlemen who, by their words, their efforts, and exertions, had contributed to the promotion of the work which to him appeared anything else but right, anything else but virtuous.

He believed that this war was unnecessary and unconstitutional in its commencement by the President, and that it was unconstitutional in its continuance by Congress, so far as it was a war of conquest, for he denied the power of Congress to involve the several States in a war of this character. It was not contemplated by the Constitution: on the contrary, it was expressly excluded. The Constitution was framed for "the common defence," not for aggression and conquest. He did not, therefore, any more admit the power of this House to continue a war of conquest than the power of the President to commence it.

He held the war to be unnecessary, unjust, and unconstitutional; not founded on any principle of humanity or political policy which should govern us. He, therefore, believed that every life destroyed in this war was a murder; that it was an act attended with all the moral turpitude of a crime of that kind. He believed that the shedding of the blood of these people would be charged to those who did it as the death of any human being should be charged to any assassin or murderer by whose hand he falls. Believing this, he could not vote for a resolution of thanks to them. One of the officers named was his personal and political friend; and, had the resolution been changed, and the thanks of Congress been proposed to him for his efforts for peace in the settlement of the Norteastern boundary question, he (Mr. G.) would have voted it cordially; for this distinguished officer then performed an act for which every feeling of his (Mr. G.'s) heart was borne out in gratitude to him, and most gladly would he have thanked him. But, when he had gone to Mexico, Mr. G. must say that, for all he had done there, he had no pulsations of gratitude to him.

He had a further objection to this laudatory resolution to military officers. Our military establishment had grown up to be one of gigantic stature, insomuch that it now cost from one hundred to one hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars a day for the support of our military forces which were employed in Mexico. And for what purpose? To subjugate the people of that country to our will. We proclaim the right of man to self-government; that all government is founded on the consent of the governed; and yet we are sending armies to Mexico, and throwing a load of one hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars per day upon the labouring millions of our country to keep up an army to subjugate the people of that country! When it was done, would the people of this country receive any benefit from it? Would they sleep better? Would they enjoy more peace of conscience, and would they be better entitled to the approbation of posterity? No; the reverse of all this would be the case.

At least twenty thousand of our citizens had been sacrificed to this phantom of military ambition; and, when Congress came to pass laudatory resolutions to those employed in this work of blood, he could not unite in it.—Every feeling of his heart, every emotion of his mind, was in opposition to this work of bloodshed.

He knew he had been taunted with being opposed to his country; that, from the opposite side of this chamber, the day after the war bill was passed, he was assailed and charged with opposing his country. Where were the men who assailed him? Echo answered "where!"—Where was his colleague, (Mr. ——.) That colleague had had leave to stay at home.

He could not mingle in this work of blood. Even a Pagan Governor, (Pilate,) when he saw the determination on the part of the people to shed blood, took water and washed his hands, and called the people to witness that he was innocent; and should he a professed Christian, the Representative of a Christian people, hesitate to wash his hands of the great crime, and moral turpitude of this wholesale murder which had been carried on for eighteen months in Mexico?

He proceeded at some length to express what had been his feelings in relation to the annexation of Texas and the system of conquest which appeared to have been adopted, and he was understood, though very indistinctly heard, to say that he had expressed his apprehension that they would lead to the dissolution of the Union.

He was likewise understood to make some remarks on the position of the Whig party in relation to the extension of Slavery, to the numerous petitions sent from the people to this House against that wrong, and he expressed the wish that the spirit which prevailed in 1776 would again influence this nation and assert the rights of man. He said allusion had been made by gentlemen on the other side of the House to the next Presidency, and to the position of the Whigs on that question; and as a Whig, he said if the Whigs should nominate and support a man whose opinions they did not know, or who had told them he would not be their candidate, their party would be blown to the winds, and they would be disbanded.

Letter from Mrs. Adams.

On Wednesday, the 1st instant, Speaker Winthrop laid before the House the following letter from the widow of the lamented John Quincy Adams:

WASHINGTON, Feb. 29, 1848.

SIR:—The resolutions in honour of my dear deceased husband, passed by the illustrious assembly over which you preside, and of which he, at the moment of his death, was a member, have been duly communicated to me.

Penetrated with grief at this distressing event of my life, mourning the loss of one who has been at once my example and my support through the trials of half a century, permit me, nevertheless, to express through you my deepest gratitude for the signal manner in which the public regard has been manifested by your honourable body, and the consolation derived to me and mine from the reflection that the unwearied efforts of an old public servant have not even in this world proved without their reward in the generous appreciation of them by his country.

With great respect, I remain Sir,
Your obedient servant,
LOUISA CATHERINE ADAMS.

To Hon. Robert C. Winthrop, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

On Thursday, the 2d, the Speaker called the House to order at the usual hour, and with the usual formalities.

On motion of Mr. Marsh, of Vermont, the Speaker of the House was authorized to fill the vacancy in the Chairmanship of the Committee on the Congressional Library caused by the death of John Quincy Adams. Mr. Palfrey, of Massachusetts, was appointed.

☞ We are indebted to Mr. Duer, M. C. from New York, for a copy of his speech "on the Origin of the War with Mexico, and the objects of the Administration in its prosecution."

This Week's Paper.

Fourth Page:—*Poetry*: Iron; The Saw-Mill *Miscellany*: Gottreich Hartmann; The Hagman's Show; The Power of Kindness; Vegetarian Conference; Love One Another; Gleanings from Foreign papers.

First Page:—*Peculiar Institutions*: Life at the South. *Selections*: Report of the Minority of the Committee on Military Affairs, &c.; The Cause of the War—Texas and her Boundary.

Second Page: Extract from Speech of Mr. Dwight; An Address &c.; Female Slave Lecturer; An Interesting Slave Case.

Married.

In Hingham, (Mass) on Thursday evening, 2d inst. by Rev. Oliver Stearns, Isaac Winslow, of Boston, to Abby Frothingham, daughter of the late Hon. Ebenezer Gay.

In Boston, Hon. Grashom B. Weston, of Duxbury, to Debora Brownell, daughter of the late Edmund Brownell, Esq. of Little Compton, (R. I.)

Died.

On Thursday, March, 2d, at her residence in Baltimore, Mrs. Hannah Kitty Chase, widow of the late distinguished Judge Samuel Chase, of Maryland, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, aged 97.

On Monday, February 28th, in the 77th year of his age, James Thorburn, a native of Dalkeith, Scotland, and 54 years a resident of this city.

In Easthampton, Mrs. Sybil M. wife of Rev. Hiram Bingham. She has been a missionary at the Sandwich Islands twenty years of her life.

In Claremont, (N. H.) Hon. George B. Upham, aged 80, one of the most distinguished lawyers of that State, and formerly a member of Congress. He was probably the most wealthy man in the State.

GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.

Foreign.

From Dispatches to the Tribune.

Arrival of the Britannia.

The Cunard steamer *Britannia*, Capt. W. J. C. Lang, arrived at Boston at 8 o'clock on Saturday morning, after a tempestuous passage of almost twenty-one days. She encountered head winds during nearly the whole time, and for several days made but about eighty miles a day. She sailed on the 12th, and brings news fourteen days later.

The Britannia brought 37 passengers from Liverpool—2 to Halifax, 35 to Boston—and 13 from Halifax to Boston.

The Prices of Bread-stuffs, &c. in Liverpool, reduced into Dollars and Cents, at 484 Cents to the pound Sterling.

Articles.	*January 28.*
United States Wheat, white, per 70lb.	$1 87 to $2 12
do do red, per 70lb.	1 57 to 1 93
Indian Corn, per 480lb.	7 26 to 7 98
Indian Meal, per barrel, 196lb.	3 39 to 3 50
United States Flour per barrel,	6 50 to 7 00
Ashes, United States Pot, per 112lb.	6 37 to 6 49
do do Pearl, per 112lb.	7 26 to 7 50
Beef, Mess, per barrel, 200lb.	9 60 to 11 05
Lard, fine, per 112lb.	14 04 to 14 76
Three Per Cent. Consols	89 5 8 to 89 3 4
Articles.	*February 12.*
United States Wheat, white, per 70lb.	$1 81 to $2 12
do do red, per 70lb.	1 57 to 1 81
Indian Corn, per 480lb.	6 77 to 7 23
Indian Meal, per barrel, 196lb.	3 26 to 3 50
United States Flour, per barrel	6 25 to 6 73
Ashes, United States Pot, per 112lb.	6 37 to 6 49
do do Pearl, per 112lb.	7 26 to 7 50
Beef, Mess, per barrel, 200lb.	9 60 to 10 47
Lard, fine, per 112lb.	13 31 to 14 28
Three Per Cent. Consols,	89 1-3 to 89 2 3

England.—The packet ship Prince Albert, which left London on the 1st February for New York, with ten camels and two elephants, for Sands, Lent & Co.'s Circus, put back from stress of weather, and arrived at Portsmouth on the 4th.

The sailing days of the vessels of the British and North American Steamship Company have been altered. The day of sailing from Boston and New York will be changed from Saturday to Wednesday, commencing on Wednesday, the 5th of April, instead of Saturday, the 8th. No alteration will take place in the sailing day from Liverpool, which will continue to be Saturday. The weekly sailings will commence from Liverpool on the 8th of April, and from America on the 3d of May.

Parliament.—The English Parliament assembled on the 3d of February. The first business of which was the consideration of "the deplorable condition" of the West India Islands. An animated debate ensued, in which in which it was asserted that the islands in which Slavery was still tolerated were "gaining money by slave labour, while the [English] West Indians were losing it by free labour, and had no more money to expend." A most remarkable feature of the debate was the proposition made by Lord George Bentinck, that in consideration of the debt of £45,000,000 due the English Government from Spain, for which the whole island of Cuba stood pledged, the island should be seized, the mortgage foreclosed, and Slavery extinguished forever in the West Indian Archipelago.

The Jewish Disabilities bill, which has occupied a large share of the attention of Parliament, it is thought will pass the Commons by a considerable majority; but its fate in the Upper House is regarded as very doubtful.

Lord Morpeth has once more brought in a bill for the better protection of health in towns by the improved sanatory regulations. It was read a first time, and fixed to be read a second time on the 18th.

A bill has been introduced into Parliament to enable the Queen to establish diplomatic relations with the Court of Rome.

A correspondence between Lord Palmerston and Mr. Bancroft on the subject of the Navigation Laws had been laid before the House of Lords.

A demonstration by the masters, mates, and seamen at London, had been made against the repeal of the navigation laws. A boat procession was formed on the Thames, and a petition was presented to the Home Secretary, against the proposed repeal, and representing that such a repeal would bring ruin on the mercantile marine of the country.

Shipwreck and Massacre.—The British whaler Sovereign was wrecked on August 17, on the Eastern side of the Sandwich Islands; the captain and 28 men of the crew were massacred by the natives. One only escaped by concealing himself in some bushes and swimming off to another vessel that luckily came along.

The Duke of Brunswick has obtained a verdict of $1,000 against the *Satirist* newspaper for a libel published against him.

Ireland.—The most interesting fact in regard to this country is, perhaps, a rescript from Rome in relation to the alleged denunciations by the Clergy from the altar.

The Repeal Association.—The weekly meeting of this body, on Monday, was but thinly attended. A long letter was read from Mr. John O'Connell, dated London, Feb. 4, announcing that his Repeal motion is fixed for the 17th instant in the House of Commons, but may be postponed till March, to secure a better attendance of members.

The rent for the week was £68 17s. 6d.; the previous week was £177 8s. 4d.

The Special Commission.—This body has adjourned, after having passed the most severe sentences upon all the prisoners whose guilt has been proved. Upward of fifty were convicted of agrarian outrages, and the sentence of death passed on no fewer than sixteen, who were guilty of murder. Two of these were executed on the 7th ult.; it was hoped that the others might not be put to death. Still, however, the condition of the country is little better than before the trials. Tipperary has again been the scene of frightful murders, as well as Leitrim.

General Items.

The following inscription, the composition of Mr. Palfrey, was on the breast-plate on the lid of the coffin of Mr. Adams:

(Eagle with scroll.)
"John Quincy Adams,
Born
An Inhabitant of Massachusetts, July 11, 1767,
Died
A Citizen of the United States,
In the Capitol at Washington,
Feb. 23, 1848.
Having served his country
for half a century,
and enjoyed its highest
Honours."

Healy's Portrait of Adams.—This fine work of art, finished about a year since, by order of Louis Philippe, has, we are glad to learn, been retained in this country, for the purpose of engraving, by permission of his French Majesty. Mr. J. Andrews, of Boston, has been at work upon it, and has it nearly ready for the publisher.

Change of Name.—The inhabitants of the village of Rocky Point, near Greenpoint, L. I. at a public meeting resolved that their village shall hereafter be called Marion.

Hon. Edward Everett, President of Harvard University, has been invited by the Massachusetts Legislature to deliver a eulogy on the Life and Character of the late John Quincy Adams.

Louisville and Liverpool.—The ship Minesota, a large and newly-built vessel, is to leave Louisville on the 14th of March next, for the port of Liverpool direct. This is, we believe, the second instance of a ship communication between the very inland of our continent, and the seaports of the Old World.

The Brunswick (Me.) Advertiser states that among the medical students at the present session of the medical school of that place, are several coloured men.

Case of Michael Walsh.—In the case of Michael Walsh, convicted of a libel on Hiram P. Hastings, but recommended to the mercy of the Court on account of mitigating circumstances, has been sentenced to pay a fine of $25.

Mr. Adams's Diary.—It is well known that the patient labour of years has been devoted by Mr. Adams to the regular journalizing of all events which have occurred, not only under his own eye, but also in any way referring to the legislative and diplomatic history of our country. Is it not advisable that Congress should adopt some plan to have them placed before the public at the National expense? They will, doubtless, prove a perfect compendium of the History of the Union, since Mr. Adams first entered public life.—*Philadelphia North American.*

Death of Judge Campbell, of Tennessee.—Judge Geo. W. Campbell, of Nashville, Tennessee, died on the 18th inst. The deceased has occupied seats in each House of Congress, was Chairman of the most important Committee in the House during Mr. Jefferson's Administration, and was Chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs in the Senate, when war was declared. He was also Secretary of the Treasury under Mr. Madison, and was afterwards appointed Minister to Russia, by Mr. Monroe. He was, at the time of his death, 75 years of age.

The Telegraph in Peru.—Late accounts from South America state, that one of Morse's Telegraph apparatus had been received, and was to be put in operation between Lima and Callao, a distance of about ten miles. The invention has been received with much favour; and the establishment of a regular telegraphic communication between the principal cities of the Pacific coast is recommended.

Mons. Vattemare and Mr. Adams.—The Washington Union of Saturday evening, relates the following incident:

"This day week the distinguished man, to whose memory so many thousands of persons, of all ages, sexes, and conditions, contributed to pay the last honours on this day, was employed for two or three hours in inspecting, in Mr. Vattemare's room, the beautiful books, engravings, and medals which he had brought with him from France. His object was to take such a *coup d'œil* of these articles as would enable him to place a *regime* before the House of Representatives that would exhibit an outline of the whole, and would do justice to the labours of the generous enthusiast. The necessary papers connected with this explanation were lying upon Mr. Adams's desk on Monday morning. We understand his intention was to rise, when his name was called to make his *exposé*, and to follow it up with an appropriate motion in relation to Mr. Vattemare. Before his name was called, Mr. Adams was struck down with the mortal blow which has consigned him to the tomb."

The Union and the Treaty.—The Washington Union of Saturday, has an article in reference to the rumors in circulation with regard to the Treaty which is now before the Senate. It asserts that the Treaty was not, as is alleged, made by Mr. Trist by private instructions from Mr. Polk, and that the Cabinet knew nothing of it; that there is no provision in the Treaty about the Wilmot-Proviso, as has been stated; and that there is a large cession of country made to us, "of a greater extent than any country in Europe, except Russia;" that the territory does include the bay of San Francisco in the 37-38th degree of north latitude. "In fact," adds the Union, "we acquire, according to the reported speculations of the Treaty, all the best ports on the Pacific line in California, even counting down to the extreme cape in the peninsula. We shall gain some of the finest harbours in the world—harbours which are essential to the comfort and convenience of the six or seven hundred whale ships that flock to this region. On this account alone, Massachusetts may well boast of the acquisition, if it should be accomplished."

A Rare Fact.—A correspondent writes us that there is not a single drunkard in the village of Boonton, N.J. (comprising 800 inhabitants,) nor a tavern where people can obtain intoxicating drinks.

Prevention of Suicide.—Mr. Kinney, member of the Legislature of Massachusetts, is anxious to establish a law for the prevention of suicide. He proposes that all self-murderers shall forfeit their bodies for dissection

Henry L. Wheaton, of Dudley, (Mass.) has been appointed President of the University at Norwich, (Vt.) in the place of Col. Ransom, deceased.

The Hutchinson Family gave their first concert at the Tabernacle, the sixth of March.

Twenty-five cent silver coins, so admirably counterfeited that the eye cannot detect them, are in circulation. The ring is false, and the practiced ear may detect the counterfeit readily by the sound

The highest honour which can be bestowed in France upon a foreigner, has been conferred on Mr. Bancroft.—He has been chosen a Corresponding Member of the Institute. The United States has two out of seven in a class of history selected from the whole world.

Squads of boys of every age, says a correspondent of the *Louisville Journal*, from six to eighteen years may be seen every evening at the corners of the streets, inhaling chloroform as a matter of amusement, and apparently unconscious of the danger that they expose themselves to from such a free use of the powerful agent.

Cassius M. Clay is to lecture on "Mexico," at Baltimore (before the Mercantile Library Association,) on Tuesday the 7th inst.

A little over forty years ago, Aaron Burr was brought to trial on a charge of treason for undertaking to raise within the limits of the United States the means of wresting Mexico from the dominion of Spain. It was treason *then* to dream of the conquest of Mexico, but it is *now* the height of patriotism to undertake it!—*Louisville Examiner.*

Hon. William Sawyer, of Sausage memory, has been appointed by the President, Minister to Bogot. He should have been sent to Bologna.—*Chicago Journal.*

The Buffalo Express of Tuesday states that the ice has passed out of the harbour, and is free for the resumption of navigation. The Lake is as clear of ice as in July. A strong wind from the southwest had been blowing for several days, and no ice had made its appearance, which is good evidence that there has been none of consequence above. This is without precedent in the history of Lake Erie navigation.

NOTICES.

☞ AID FOR THE CAUSE—ATTRACTIVE DISPLAY! ☜

Dear Mr. Garrison:—May I have the privilege of acknowledging through the Liberator, the safe reception of the two boxes of beautiful goods sent per the "St. Petersburg" and "North Bend," by our esteemed friends in Bristol, England. A mere description however minute, would fail to do justice, to the taste and munificence of these valued friends. The beautiful drawings, the rare and curious *petits objects* of various kinds, the attractive toys, the exquisite needle work, Honiton lace, novel styles of knitting, &c. must be seen to be in the least appreciated.

In order therefore, to gratify all the friends of the cause by the sight of these beautiful contributions, as well as mainly for its promotion by converting them into money at a time when we so much need it for the prosecution of the cause, it has been decided to have this SALE OF GOODS (to which allusion was made in the Bazaar Gazette) take place NEXT WEEK. It is proposed to display these boxes, with the beautiful things remaining from the Bazaar, many of which (especially the transparent knit shawls) are particularly suited to the spring market, at

21 *Cornhill, up Stairs*,

and by thus converting the Society's rooms into a *Magasin des modes*, for a few days, it is confidently hoped a good work will be done for the cause. There will be no expensive arrangements made for the display of the goods and the decoration of the rooms, and therefore there will be NO ADMISSION FEE.

I am, dear Sir,
Yours diligently for the Cause,
M. W. CHAPMAN.

I take this opportunity to acknowledge the receipt and careful delivery of parcels by the Bristol boxes the following named persons:—

1 to Mr. Wm. Ware, 1 to Rev. Mr. Livingston,
1 to Rev. R. W. Waterston, 1 to Mrs. Follen,
1 to Rev. S. May,

Boston, Feb. 28, 1848.

Advertisements.

New Goods,
AT THE
FREE PRODUCE STORE,
JUST RECEIVED.
GENERAL REDUCTION IN PRICES.

Fine 4-4 Prints, various, styles.
New styles of Prints of medium quality, usual width.
Fine and wide Paper Muslins. Also Coloured Cambrics.
Curtain Calico. Superior fine Chintz Umbrellas. Oil Cloths.
Satinets, good and cheap. Also on hand, mostly at reduced prices, Ginghams, various qualities and styles.
Fine and heavy Shirting, Sheeting, and Pillow Muslins.
Striped Cambrics. Fine 6-4 Plaid Muslin.
Muslin de Lain, plain and neatly figured, all wool.
Linens, warranted free from cotton.
Flannels 4-4 good and price low. Canton flannels, white and coloured.
Table Diaper and Cloths, of different styles.
Apron and Furniture Check. Cotton Handkerchiefs.
Cotton Twilled Pantaloon Stuffs. Also Linen Drilling, &c.
Long and Half Hose, fine and heavy.
Knitting Cotton, various Nos. bleached, brown, and coloured.
Wadding, white and coloured Cotton Laps. Also,
Refined Loaf, Crushed and Pulverised Sugar.
Brown Sugar, good quality, of various grades.

The whole stock exclusively Free Labour Goods, to which the subscriber would invite the attention of Country Merchants, as well as his friends and the public generally.

Much pains are taken by the Managers of the Free Produce Association, to assist the subscriber to enlarge the assortment from time to time.

GEORGE W. TAYLOR,
Northwest corner Fifth and Cherry sts.
Philadelphia, 2d mo. 1st, 1848.—1y.*

**British Periodical Liter

Poetry.

IRON.

BY MRS. SARAH JOSEPHA HALE.

"Truth shall spring out of the earth."—Psalms lxxv. 11.

As in lonely thought, I pondered
On the marv'lous things of earth,
And, in fancy's dreaming, wondered
At their beauty, power, and worth,
Came, like words of prayer, the feeling—
Oh! that God would make me know,
Through the spirit's clear revealing—
What, of all his works below,
Is to man a boon the greatest,
Brightening on from age to age,
Serving truest, earliest, latest,
Through the world's long pilgrimage.

Soon vast mountains rose before me,
Shaggy, desolate, and lone,
Their scarred heads were threat'ning o'er me,
Their dark shadows round me thrown;
Then a voice, from out the mountains,
As an earthquake shook the ground,
And like frightened fawns the fountains,
Leaping, fled before the sound;
And the Anak oaks bowed lowly,
Quivering, aspen-like, with fear—
While the deep response came slowly,
Or it must have crushed mine ear!

"Iron! Iron! Iron!"—crashing,
Like the battle-axe and shield;
Or the sword on helmit clashing,
Through a bloody battle-field:
"Iron! Iron! Iron!"—rolling,
Like the far-off cannon's boom;
Or the death knell, slowly tolling,
Through a dungeon's charnel gloom!
"Iron! Iron! Iron!"—swinging,
Like the summer winds at play;
Or as bells of Time were ringing
In the blest Millennial Day!

Then the clouds of ancient fable
Cleared away before mine eyes;
Truth could tread a footing stable
O'er the gulf of mysteries!
Words, the prophet bards had uttered,
Signs, the oracle foretold,
Spells, the weird-like Sybil muttered,
Through the twilight days of old,
Rightly read, beneath the splendour,
Shining now on history's page,
All their faithful witness render—
All portend a better age.

Sisyphus, for ever toiling,
Was the type of toiling men,
While the stone of power, recoiling,
Crushed them back to earth again!
Stern Prometheus, bound and bleeding,
Imaged man in mental chain,
While the vultures, on him feeding,
Were the passions' vengeful reign;
Still a ray of mercy tarried
On the cloud, a white winged dove,
For this mystic faith had married
Vulcan to the Queen of Love!

Rugged strength and radiant beauty—
These were one in nature's plan;
Humble toil and heavenward duty—
These will form the perfect man!
Darkly was this doctrine taught us
By the gods of heathendom;
But the living light was brought us,
When the gospel morn had come!
How the glorious change, expected,
Could be wrought, was then made free;
Of the earthly, when perfected,
Rugged Iron forms the key!

"Truth from out the earth shall flourish,"
This the Word of God makes known—
Thence are harvests men to nourish—
There let Iron's power be shown.
Of the swords, from slaughter gory
Ploughshares forge to break the soil:—
Then will Mind attain its glory,
Then will Labour reap the spoil,—
Error cease the soul to wilder,
Crime be checked by simple good,
As the little coral builder,
Forces back the furious flood.

While our faith in good grows stronger,
Means of greater good increase;
Iron, slave of war no longer,
Leads the onward march of peace;
Still new modes of service finding,
Ocean, earth, and air it moves,
And the distant nations binding,
Like the kindred tie it proves;
With its Atlas shoulder sharing
Loads of human toil and care;
On its wing of lightning bearing
Thought's swift mission through the air!

As the rivers, farthest flowing,
In the highest hills have birth;
As the banyan, broadest growing,
Often bows its head to earth,—
So the noblest minds press onward,
Channels far of good to trace;
So the largest hearts bend downward,
Circling all the human race;
Thus, by Iron's aid, pursuing
Through the earth their plans of love,
Men our Father's will are doing,
Here, as angels do above!

From the German of Korner.

THE SAW-MILL.

BY WILLIAM C. BRYANT.

In yonder mill I rested,
And sat me down to look
Upon the wheel's quick glimmer,
And on the flowing brook.

As in a dream before me,
The saw, with restless play,
Was cleaving through a fir-tree
Its long and steady way.

The tree through all its fibres,
With living motion stirred,
And, in a dirge-like murmur,
These solemn words I heard—

Oh, thou who wanderest hither,
A timely guest thou art!
For thee this cruel engine
Is passing through my heart.

When soon, in earth's still bosom,
Thy hours of rest begin,
This wood shall form the chamber
Whose walls shall close thee in.

Four planks—I saw and shuddered—
Dropped in that busy mill;
Then, as I tried to answer,
At once the wheel was still.

Miscellany.

From Richter's Reminiscences.

GOTTREICH HARTMANN.

In the little village of Heim, Gottreich Hartmann resided with his old father, who was a curate; and although the old man had well-nigh outlived all those whom he had loved, he was made happy by his son. Gottreich discharged his duties for him in the parish, not so much in aid of his parent's unflinching vigour, as to satisfy his own energy, and to give his father the exquisite gratification of being edified by his child and companion.

How beautiful and how pure is the position of God's ministers! All that is good dwells around them—religion, poetry, and the life of a shepherd of souls; whilst other professions oft serve only to choke up this goodly neighbourhood. Son and father seemed to live in one another; and on the site of filial and paternal love, there arose the structure of a rare and singular friendship. Gottreich not only cheered his father by the new birth of his lost poet's youth, but by the still more beautiful similarity of their faith.

Gottreich possessed a paradise in which he laboured as his father's gardener. He was at once the wife, the brother, the friend, the all that is to be loved by man, of his parent. Every Sunday brought him a new pleasure—that of preaching a sermon before his father. He displayed so much power in his pulpit eloquence, that he seemed to labour more for the elevation and edification of his father, than for the enlightenment of the common people, though he held a maxim which I take to be far from erroneous—that the highest subjects of intellectual speculation, are good for the people as for children; and that *man can only learn to rise, from the consideration of that which he cannot surmount.*

To these two happy men was added a happy woman also. Justa, an orphan, sole mistress of her property, had entirely left and sold the trading-house which had been her father's, in the town, and had removed into the upper part of a good peasant's cottage, to live entirely in the country. Justa did nothing in the world by halves; but she often did things more than most would deem completely, at least in all that touched her generosity. She had not long resided in the village of Heim, and had seen the meek Gottreich, and had listened to some of his spring-tide sermons, ere she discovered that he had won her heart, filled, as it was, with the love of virtue. She, nevertheless, refused to grant him her hand, until the conclusion of the great peace, after which they were to be married. She was ever fonder of doing what is difficult than what is easy. I wish that it was here the place to tell of the May-time life they led, which seemed to blossom in the low parsonage-house hard by the church door under Justa's hand; how she came in the morning from her own cottage, to order matters in the little dwelling for the day; how the evenings were passed in the garden, ornamented with few but pretty flower-beds, and commanding a view of many a well-watered meadow and distant hill, and stars without number; how these three hearts played into one another, no one of which, in this most pure and intimate intercourse, knew or felt anything which was not of the fairest; and how good and gay intention marked the passage of their lives. Every bench was a church chair; all was peaceful and holy; and the firmament above an infinite church dome.

In many a village, and in many a house, a true Eden may be hid, which has neither been named nor marked down; for joy is fond of covering over and concealing her tenderest flowers. Gottreich reposed in such a fulness of bliss and love, of poetry and religion, of springtime, of the past and of the future, that he feared in the bottom of his heart to speak his happiness out, save in prayer. In prayer, thought he, man may say all—his happiness and his misery. His father was very happy also. There came over him a warm old age, no winter night, but a summer evening without frost or darkness; albeit the sun of his life was sunk pretty deep below the mound of earth under which his wife was lain down to sleep.

Nothing recalls the close of life to a noble-hearted young man, so much as precisely the happiest and fairest hours which he passes. Gottreich, in the midst of the united fragrance and beauty of the flowers of joy, even with the morning-star of life above him, could not but think on the time when the same should appear to him as the evening-star, warning him of sleep. Then said he to himself: "All is now so certain and so clear before me—the beauty and the holiness of life, the splendour of the universe, the Creator, the dignity and the greatness of man's heart, the bright images of eternal truth, the whole starry firmament of ideas, which enlightens, instructs, and upholds man! But when I am grown old, and in the obstruction of death, will not all that now rustles so bloomingly and livingly about me, appear gray and dull? Just when man is approaching that heaven which he has so long contemplated, death holds the telescope, invested before his dim eye, and lets him see only what is empty, distant, shadowy. But is this indeed true? Shall I be more likely to be right when I only feel and think, and hope, with half a life, incapable of a keen glance or an intense sensation? or am I right now that my whole heart is warm, that my whole head is clear, and my strength fresh? I acknowledge that the present is the fittest season, and that precisely because I *do* acknowledge it to be the fittest. I will then live through this daytime of truth attentively, and bear it away with me to the evening dusk, that it may lighten my end."

[In the midst of all this happiness, Gottreich obeyed the call to war—the "holy war" of 1813 and 1814. The tale proceeds, as he returned after the campaign was ended. It was at the coming up of a thunder-storm.]

At last he entered quietly the parsonage house, and slowly opened the well-known door. The room was empty, but he heard a noise overhead. When he opened the door of his upper chamber, which was filled with a glow from the West, Justa was kneeling before the bed of his father, who, sitting half upright, was looking with a haggard, stiff, and bony countenance toward the setting sun before him. A clasp of her lover to her breast, and one exclamation, was all his reception. But his father stretched his wizened hand slowly out, and said with difficulty—"Thou art come at the right time!" without adding whether he spoke of the preachings, or of their separation.

Justa hastily related how the old man had overworked himself, till body and spirit had given way together; so that he no longer took a share in anything, though he longed to be with the sharers; and how he lay prostrate with broken wings, looking upwards like a needy child.

On a sudden the landscape grew dark—all the winds stood pent, the earth oppressed; then there came a gush of rain and a crash of thunder. The lightning streamed around the old man, and he looked up altered and astonished. "Hist!" said he, "I hear the rain once more; speak quickly, children, for I shall soon depart."

Both his children clung to him; but he was too weak to embrace them.

And now, as the warm healing springs of the clouds bathed the sick earth down from the dripping tree to the blades of grass, and as the sky glistened mildly as with a tear of joy, and the thunder went warring away behind the distant mountains, the sick man pointed upwards, and said, "Seest thou the lordliness of God! My son, strengthen now at the last my weary soul with something holy, in the spirit of love, and not of penance; for if our hearts condemn us not, then have we confidence toward God. Say something rich in love to me of God and of his works."

"Remember in the dark hour those times when thou hast prayed to God in ecstasy; and when thou hast thought on Him—the greatest thought of finite man—the Infinite One!"

Here the old man clasped his hands, and prayed low.

"Hast thou not known and felt the existence of that Being, whose infinity consists not only in his strength, in his wisdom, and in his eternity, but also in his love and in his justice? Canst thou forget the time when the blue sky by night opened on thee, as if the mildness of God was looking down on thee? Hast thou not felt the love of the Infinite, when it veiled itself in its image, in loving hearts of men, as the sun which casts its light not on our moon alone, for our nights, but on the morning and evening star also, and on every little twinkler, even to the furthest from the earth?

"Remember, in the dark hour, how in the spring of thy life, the mounds of earth which are graves, appeared to thee only as the mountain tops of another far and new world; and how in the midst of the fulness of life, thou didst acknowledge the value of death."

"Speak of our Redeemer!" said the father.

"Remember Jesus Christ in the dark hour; remember him who also passed through life; remember that soft Moon of the infinite Sun, given to enlighten the night of the world. Let life be hallowed to thee, and death also; for he shared both of them with thee. May his calm and lofty form look down on thee in the last darkness, and show thee his Father!"

A low roll of thunder was now heard to pass over the dun clouds which the tempest had left; and the setting sun filled the entire vault of heaven with the magnificence of his fire.

"Remember, in the last hour, how the heart of man can love. Canst thou forget the love wherewith one heart repays a thousand hearts, and the soul during life is nourished and vivified from another soul, as the oak of a hundred years clings fast to the same spot with its roots, and derives new strength, and sends forth new buds during its hundred springs?"

"Dost thou mean me?" said the father.

"I mean my mother also," replied the son.

Justa wept when she heard how her lover would console himself in his last hours, with the reminiscence of the days of her love; and the father said, but very gently, thinking on his wife—"To meet again, to meet again!"

"Remember then, in the last hour," continued Gottreich, "that pure being with whom thy life was beautiful and great; with whom thou hast wept tears of joy; with whom thou hast prayed to God; and in whom God appeared unto thee; in whom thou didst find the first and last heart of love; and then close thine eyes in peace!"

On a sudden the clouds were cleft into two huge, black mountains, and the deep sun looked forth from between them, as it were out of a valley between buttresses of rock, gazing upon the earth with its joy-glistening eye.

"See!" said the dying man, "what a glare!"

"It is the evening sun, father."

"Ay, this day shall we see one another again!" continued the old man; but he spoke of his wife, who was long since dead.

The son was unable, from his emotion, to paint to his father the blessedness of meeting again upon the earth, which he had that very day enjoyed by anticipation, and described upon his journey; or, to say to him how it comes that meeting again is a renewal of love in a better state; and that, if the first meeting was apt to overflow into the future, reminiscence binds the flowers of the present and the fruits of the past upon one stem.

Who could have courage to speak of the joys of earthly meeting to one who seemed to be already in the contemplation of a meeting in heaven?

Startled, he asked, "Father, what ails thee?"

"I do think thereon in the dark hour; ay, thereon and thereupon again; and death is also beautiful; and the parting in Christ," murmured to himself the old man, as he tried to take Gottreich's hand, which he had not strength to press. It was but the usual nervous snatching of the fingers of the dying. He continued to think that his son was still speaking to him, and said more and more distinctly and emphatically, "O thou blessed God!" until all the other luminaries of life were extinguished, and in his soul there stood nothing but the one sun—God.

At length he raised himself, and stretching out his arm forcibly, exclaimed—"There are three fair rainbows over the evening sun. I must go after the sun, and pass through with him!" He then fell back, and all was over.

At that moment the sun went down, and there glimmered at his setting a broad rainbow in the East.

"He is gone!" said Gottreich to Justa, in a voice choked with grief; "but he is gone from us unto his God, in the midst of great, pious, and unmingled joy: then weep no more, Justa!"

At that moment his own hitherto restrained tears found a vent, and he pressed the dead hand against his face.

It grew dark, and a warm rain distilled gently over the earth. The children left his motionless form alone, and wept more tranquilly for the sun of their love, which, with its pure light, had withdrawn from the clouds and tempest of the world to another dawn.

From Douglas Jerrold's Weekly Newspaper.

THE HANGMAN'S SHOW.

The charge of mawkish sentimentalism is often preferred against the advocates of the abolition of capital punishment. Sentimentalism, mawkish or otherwise, is certainly not the feeling excited in the minds of the persons who congregate at an execution, and for whose edification the spectacle is presumed to be intended. The hangman is supposed, by his patrons and employers, to be the expositor of a great moral lesson. Let us see, then, what is the effect of his teaching on the public mind. Let the gallows stand or fall by its utility. It will doubtless be allowed that a criminal is not hanged for his own good, but for that of others. The spectacle of an execution is designed for the advantage of the beholders. If, then, it can be shown that the dismal exhibition is productive of more evil than good to those who witness it, the argument against the continuance of capital punishment is unanswerable. Whether compassion for the culprit is morbid or not, there is nothing morbid in consideration for the community. We subjoin a picture of the recent execution of Reid, at York, drawn by the reporter of the Globe. A public strangulation is popularly termed "Hang Fair." The exactness of the resemblance of the Hangman's Show, as exhibited at York, to the scene presented at Greenwich on Easter Monday, is thus demonstrated by our contemporary:

"The behaviour of the crowd on this occasion was, for the most part, indecorous—at least until the execution was actually over; although the anxiety to gain a view of the scaffold caused a good deal of pushing, and some little fighting, there was no intentional violation of the principles of decency. At the same time there seemed to be no feeling of the solemnity and awful nature of the proceedings going on, which appeared to be regarded as a *passing means of temporary excitement*. All feeling of solemnity was greatly militated against by the fact that those in the part of the crowd not immediately surrounding the scaffold, being generally unable to see over the heads of those in front of them, kept jumping off the ground incessantly to catch a glimpse at the scene on the gallows. This incessant jumping gave the crowd an appearance like that of a tribe of savages dancing a death-dance, and utterly prevented those who were engaged in it from feeling anything of the impressiveness which should attach to exhibitions of the kind. Arrangements existed in the crowd in the shape of stools, chairs, fruit barrows, &c. for enabling those who chose to pay a few pence for the accommodation to see over the heads of the crowd. Sundry fights took place between the owners of these chairs and barrows and persons who endeavoured to spring upon them unobserved for the sake of evading the fee, and the general manner of the crowd differed little from what is observable at reviews and other out-of-door gratuitous spectacles."

Such was the conduct of that very class of spectators for whose express instruction the horrible drama was rehearsed:

"The members of the crowd were, for the most part, of the lowest class: costermongers, prostitutes, and pickpockets evidently formed the chief part, but there were also many mechanics and persons who appeared to belong to the class of tradesmen. At the windows around also appeared many persons who were at all events dressed like gentlemen, and even well dressed women were lookers on therefrom the whole time. The greater number of the persons present remained on the spot long after the man was dead, and during the interval between the actual hanging and the cutting down, which seemed to be the two parts of the process which excited the most interest. The gallows seemed to be looked upon with the most perfect indifference and laughter, and coarse jokes were rife among the mob. A few minutes before nine some slight excitement began to revive, and the barrow men again called to the crowd 'to pay a penny to see the man cut down,' and then some comic incident occurring, shouts of laughter were allowed free vent, and so with talking, and fighting, and laughing, the hour during which the body was suspended passed away. When the executioner appeared upon the scaffold again, the death dance was recommenced. Men held their children on their shoulders to 'see the sight;' and although, as the body was cut down and borne away, a slight shudder seemed to take place among a few persons, the majority were as unaffected as before. Immediately afterwards the crowd began to disperse, many of the men evidently determined to make a holyday of it."

Thus nothing was wanting to give to the whole transaction the character of a popular entertainment. As in a booth, there was the mob below; with well-dressed persons, as from boxes, surveying the performance from surrounding windows. Among the latter, too, there was a sprinkling of women, arrayed, likewise, in goodly apparel, gracing the festivity with their presence. The amusement having terminated, the crowd dispersed, "many of the men determined to make a holyday of it." Beer and pipes were the issue. The reflections of the populace on the tragedy they had been beholding were drowned—if they made any—in the pewter pot. The performance took place amid shouts of laughter, dancing, fighting, quarrelling, and, no doubt, picking of pockets. Such—with probably a conclusion in drunkenness—was the tendency of the Hangman's Show. And, but for the confession of the wretched culprit, its moral would have been completed by the execution of an innocent man.

Another entertainment was given by the showman of the Executive, on Monday last, in front of Newgate, when Thomas Sale was hanged for the murder of Mr. Bellchambers. Besides the crime for which he suffered, this man, since his conviction, had, whilst attempting to escape, committed a murderous assault on his accomplice, M'Coy, as well as on a turnkey employed to watch him. He was, in fact, a most desperate and sanguinary ruffian. Yet how was he received by the outraged humanity accumulated to witness his exit from the stage of the Old Bailey? The Morning Chronicle tells us that:

"On mounting the drop, the culprit bowed twice to the assembled crowd, *who greeted him with partial cheering*. The next moment the rope was attached, and the wretched man in a few seconds had ceased to exist."

Such was the reception given by the British public to a savage and atrocious murderer. Were these plaudits accorded to him as a miscreant and a felon? No: but as the leading tragedian—the principal performer in the Hangman's Show. Ought there not, then, to be a censor for the political drama; and should not the immoral and disgusting spectacle of Killing by the Hangman be banished from the stage of real life?

THE POWER OF KINDNESS.—Fenelon was a Roman Catholic, and Archbishop of Cambray, in France.—He was a man of the finest feelings, of the greatest benevolence, and he uniformly practiced the law—"overcome evil with good." He was kind and affable to the lowly, mild and courteous to the ignorant, philanthropic to the miserable, and ever gentle both to friend and foe. The consequence was that he won all hearts. His diocese was often the theatre of war—the English, Germans, and Dutch even surpassed the inhabitants of Cambray in their love and veneration for him. At such times, he gathered the wretched into his residence and entertained them; for his known goodness had surrounded him with a power which even contending armies could not resist; and the consequence was, that his dwellings were safe, even when towns and villages were lying in smoking ruins around him. The following is an instance of his great kindness:—He observed one day, a peasant, who had been driven from his home, and to whom Fenelon had given shelter, ate nothing. He inquired the reason: "Alas!" said the poor man "in making my escape from my cottage, I had not time to bring off my cow, which was the support of my family. The enemy will drive her away, and I shall never find another so good."—Fenelon availing himself of his privilege of safe conduct, immediately set out, accompanied by a single servant, and drove her back himself to the peasant. By thus walking according to the law of overcoming evil with good, he gained the affection of all.—The peasantry loved him as their father—and long after his death, their tears would flow when they said, "There is the chair on which our good Archbishop used to sit in the midst of us; we shall see him no more." What a crown of unfading glory the law of love gave him!—*Montgomery.*

From the Jersey (Eng.) Penny Record.

From a report of a *Vegetarian Conference* held at Ramsgate, of which Mr. Brotherton, M. P. for Salford, was the chairman, we extract the following address, delivered by the President of the Society:

"James Simpson, Jr. Esq. (President of the Society,) moved the third resolution—"That since the facts, lately developed in the science of chemistry, show that in eating the flesh of an animal, men eat, strictly speaking, only the principles of nutriment which that animal got from vegetables;—the nutriment of flesh being, in fact, *Vegetable Nutriment*—whilst the facts of Physiological research prove that farinaceous and vegetable food is more digestible than flesh-meat; it is strictly in accordance with reason, and the principles of domestic and political economy; and, at the same time, more favourable to health, to return to the original, direct, more abundant, and bounteous provision of nature, in the food of the *Vegetable Kingdom.*" He believed that much of the present practice of society, in the use of the flesh of animals, originated in a mistake as to the nutritive qualities of vegetable food, as compared with flesh-meat; and after stating that the waste of the body caused by exertion of all kinds, mental as well as physical, required to be replaced from the food, by a principle to form the blood, one to form the animal heat, and another to form the bones, he gave the statistics of the composition of the ordinary articles of food from Playfair, and others of the Liebig school of Chemistry. * * * *

They would thus see how mistaken it was to say that flesh contained more nutritive parts than vegetable food; since, whilst it contained, actually more water than most vegetables, it had less flesh-forming principles than either peas, beans, or Lentils; whilst these last contained, also, 55 per cent. of heat-forming principle, and from 3 to 3 1-2 per cent. of ashes for the bones—the solid matter of the flesh being only 25 lb. in the 100, whilst that of these others was respectively 84, 86, and 84lb. It was, also, most erroneous to suppose that flesh contained a superior kind of nutriment; since Liebig had shown that there was no difference whatever between the nutritive particles of flesh and those of vegetable food, that they were *identical;* and only to be had *secondarily* from flesh, since they *originated* in the vegetable food. It was then shown to be a violation of the principles of domestic economy to seek subsistence from flesh-meat. It contained but 25 lb. of solid matter; and the rest being water, was necessarily paid for; and so, actually, the 58s. 4d. given for the 100lb. went to buy only 25lb. of nutritive matter; thus making 100lb. of the nutritive matter of flesh cost £11 13s. 4d. whilst (as seen below) the same weight from barley-meal cost only 7s. 4 3 8d:

	Cost per 100lb.	Cost of Nutriment per 100lb.
Articles of Diet.		
Barley Meal	£0 6 3	£0 7 4 3-4
Beans	0 6 11 3-4	0 8 11-4
Wheat Meal	0 9 5 1-4	0 11 0 1-4
Peas	0 10 5	0 12 4 3-4
Beef or Mutton	2 18 4	11 13 4

and when it was seen that some of these articles of food contained more of the one kind of nutriment obtained from flesh, besides abundance of the other kinds required, it was opposed to sound sense, thus indirectly to seek in flesh the identical principle of nutriment originating in vegetables, and buy it 2,300 per cent. dearer at the same time. (Hear.)

If it were asked why flesh-meat, containing a portion of the nutriment to be had from vegetables, was different in its effects, this was due to its heating and stimulating qualities, as observed by Dr. Beaumont on the living stomach. It was to be considered as "the *Brandy* of diet." It was also a popular error to consider it more digestible; as seen on consulting the tables published by Dr. Beaumont, as the result of his carefully conducted experiments on St. Martin, into whose stomach there was an opening from the effects of a gun-shot wound.—These were the only unexceptionable experiments on the subject, and the following statements were abstracted from them:

	h.	m.
Articles of Vegetarian Diet.		
Barley Soup	1	30
Soft boiled Rice	1	0
Bean Soup	3	0
Boiled Tapioca, Barley, and Milk	2	0
Fresh Bread	3	15
Eggs (variously cooked) average	2	37
Potatoes, Beans, and Parsnips	2	30
Custard	2	45
Articles of Flesh Diet.	h.	m.
Chicken Broth	3	0
Mutton Soup	3	30
Chicken	3	15
Roast Beef	3	0
Roast Mutton	3	15
Broiled Veal	4	0
Roasted Duck	4	15
Roasted Pork	5	15

It would thus be seen, that there was a mistake in administering "*chicken broth*" to the sick, since it took as long again to digest as "*barley broth;*" and when the meat of the chicken was digested in 3 hours and 15 minutes, soft boiled rice was digested in one hour; and while barley, eggs, beans, &c. were digested in from 2 hours to 2 hours 37 minutes, roast mutton required 3 hours and 15 minutes; and roast pork 5 hours and 15 minutes.

The practice of eating flesh was also opposed to principles of political economy, as abridging the resources of the country in the production of grain, as seen by the statements made, respecting the production of vegetable food, as compared with flesh—at least fifteen times the number of people being able to subsist upon vegetable food; and, with improved cultivation sixteen times the number. The principle was an evil one which robbed the country of its resources; and it had depopulated the sheep-walks of the landlords of Scotland, and driven the people who once dwelt there, abroad.

Mr. Simpson's statements are important, and deserve our serious consideration. We understand that about 250, among whom are several medical men, and other persons of talent and influence, have signed the declaration.

From Leigh Hunt's Jar of Honey.

LOVE ONE ANOTHER.

A certain bishop, who lived some hundred years ago, and who was very unlike what is reported of her Majesty's new almoner; also very unlike the Christian bishops of old, before titles were invented for them; very unlike Fenelon too, who nevertheless had plenty of titles; very unlike St. Francis de Sales, who was for talking nothing but 'roses;' very unlike St. Vincent de Paul, who founded the Sisterhood of Charity; very unlike Rundle, who "had a heart," and Berkley who "had every virtue under heaven," and that other exquisite bishop (we blush to have forgotten his name,) who was grieved to find that he had a hundred pounds at his bankers when the season had been so bad for the poor; this highly unresembling bishop, who nevertheless was like too many of his brethren,—that is to say in times past (for there is no bishop now, at least in any quarter of England, who is not remarkable for meekness, and who does not make a point of turning his right cheek to be smitten, the moment you have smitten his left)—this unepiscopal and yet not impossible bishop, we say, was once accosted, during a severe Christmas, by a parson-Adams kind of inferior clergyman, and told a long story of the want of certain poor perple, of whose cases his lordship was unaware. What the dialogue was, which led to the remark we are about to mention, the reporters of the circumstance do not appear to have ascertained; but it seems that the representations growing stronger and stronger on one side, and the determination to pay no attention to them acquiring proportionate vigour on the other, the clergyman was moved to tell the bishop, that his lordship did not understand his eleven commandments.

"Eleven commandments!" cried the bishop; "why fellow, you are drunk. Who ever heard of an eleventh commandment? Depart, or you shall be put in the stocks."

"Put thine own drunken pride and cruelty in the stocks," retorted the good old priest, angered beyond his Christian patience, and preparing to return to the sufferers for whom he had pleaded in vain. "I say there are eleven commandments, not ten, and that it were well for such flocks as you govern, if it were added as it ought to be, to the others over the tables in church. Does your lordship remember—do you in fact know anything at all of Him who came on earth to do good to the poor and woful, and who said "Behold I give unto you a *new commandment*, LOVE ONE ANOTHER."

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

CHINESE FABLE OF THE CREATION.—"The Rationalists have penetrated furthest into the Dædalian mystery of this cosmogony, and they go on to show what Pwanku did, and how he did it. They picture him holding a chisel and mallet in his hands, splitting and fashioning vast masses of granite floating confusedly in space. Behind the openings his powerful hands has made, are seen the sun, the moon, and stars, monuments of his stupendous labours; and at his right hand, inseparable companions of his toils, but whose generation is left in obscurity, stand the dragon, the phœnix, and the tortoise, and sometimes the unicorn, divine types and progenitors with himself of the animal creation.—His efforts were continued eighteen thousand years, and by small degrees he and his work increased; the heavens rose, the earth spread out and thickened, and Pwanku grew in stature, each of them six feet every day, till, his labours done, he died for the benefit of his handywork. His head became mountains, his breath wind and clouds, and his voice thunder; his limbs were changed into the four poles, his veins into rivers, his sinews into the undulations of the earth's surface, and his flesh into fields; his beard like Berenice's hair, was turned into stars, his skin and hair into herbs and trees; and his teeth, bones, and marrow, into metals, rocks, and precious stones; his dropping sweat increased to rain, and lastly (*nascitur ridiculus mus*) the insects which stuck to his body were transformed into people!"—*William's China.*

THE GREAT TEACHER, KETCH.—From an eloquent leader in the *Manchester Examiner*, we give the following extract:—"The law destroys human life to prove its high estimate of the value of human life! It exhibits to multitudes the proof that most men; even the greatest criminals, and those to whom death should have the greatest terrors,—can meet death with firmness when it is inevitable; and that the suffering from the act of death is probably not equal to that of the majority of the operations performed daily in our hospitals. It impresses on the public mind this great fact, that there is nothing wrong or horrid in the destruction of human life, that the act, *perse*, is not blameable, and that it is only to be condemned when it arises from, and is surrounded by, certain circumstances which give it the name of murder."

LAST DAYS OF CONFUCIUS.—"Confuicius returned to his native at country the age of sixty-eight and devoted his time to the completion of his edition of the classics, and in teaching his now large band of esoteric and exoteric disciples. This work being done, he collected them around, him and made a solemn dedication of his literary labours to heaven, as the concluding act of his life. "He assembled all his disciples and led them out of the town to one of the hills where sacrifices had usually been offered for many years. Here he erected a table or altar, upon which he placed the books; then turning his face to the North, adored heaven, and returned thanks upon his knees in an humble manner for having had life and strength granted him to enable him to accomplish this laborious undertaking; he implored heaven to grant that the benefit to his countrymen form so arduous a labour might not be small. He had prepared himself for this ceremony by privacy, fasting, and prayer. Chinese pictures represent the sage in the attitude of supplication, and a beam of light or a rainbow descending from the sky upon the books, while his scholars stands around in admiring wonder."

A few days before his death he tottered about the house sighing out:

"*Tai shan ki tui hu!—Laing muh, ki hwai hu!—Chi jin, ki wei hu!*

The great mountain is broken!
The strong beam is thrown down!
The wise man is decayed!

He died soon after, B. C. 479, æt. 73, leaving a single descendant, his grandson Tsz'sz', though whom the succession has been transmitted to the present day. During his life the return of the Jews from Babylon, the invasion of Greece by Xerxes, and conquest of Egypt by the Persians, took place. Posthumous honours in great variety, amounting to idolatrous worship, has been conferred upon him.—His title is the most Holy Ancient Teacher Kung tsz', and the Holy Duke. In the reign of Kanghi, 2150 years after his death, there were eleven thousand males alive bearing his name, and most of them of the seventy-fourth generation, being undoubtedly one of the oldest families in the world.—In the Sacrificial Ritual a short account of his life is given, which closes with the following pæan:

"Confucius! Confucius! How great is Confucius!
Before Confucius there never was a Confucius!
Since Confucius there never has been a Confucius!
Confucius! Confucius! How great is Confucius!"

O'CONNELL'S TACT IN CROSS-EXAMINATION.—He was once examining a witness, whose inebriety, at the time to which the evidence referred, it was essential to his client's case to prove. He quickly discovered the man's character. He was a fellow whom we may describe as "half foolish with roguery." "Well, Darby, you told the truth to this gentleman?" "Yes, your honour, Counsellor O'Connell." "How do you know my name?" "Ah! sure every one knows our own *patriot*." "Well, you are a good humoured, honest fellow; now tell me Darby, did you take a drop of anything that day?" "Why, your honour, I took *my share* of a pint of spirits." "Your share of it; now by virtue of your oath, was not your share of it—*all but the pewter?*" "Why, then, dear knows, that's true for you, Sir. The court was convulsed at both question and answer. It soon, step by step came out that the man was drunk, and was not, therefore, a competent witness. Thus O'Connell won his case for his client.

Here is another instance of his ready tact and infinite resource in the defence of his client. In a trial at Cork for murder, the principal witness swore strongly against the prisoner. He particularly swore that a hat, found near the place of the murder, belonged to the prisoner, whose name was James.—"By virtue of your oath, are you sure that this is the same hat?" "Yes." "Did you examine it carefully before you swore in your informations that it was the prisoner's?" "I did." "Now let me see," said O'Connell, as he took up the hat, and began to examine it carefully in the inside. He then spelled aloud the name of James, slowly, thus, J-a-m-e-s. "Now, do you mean those words were in the hat when you found it?" "I do." "Did you see them there?" "I did." "And this is the same hat?" "It is." Now, my lord," said O'Connell, holding up the hat to the bench, "there is an end of the case,—there is no name whatever inscribed in the hat." The result was an instant acquittal."—*Fagan's Life and Times of O'Connell.*

THE SOCIETY OF WOMEN.—There is nothing by which I have, through life, more profited than by the just observations, the good opinion, and the sincere and gentle encouragement, of amiable and sensible women.—*Romilly.*

PERSONAL APPEARANCE OF DR. HAMPDEN.—To those who do not know Dr. Hampden, it may be interesting to state that he is a small, slight-made man, of not less, to all appearance, than sixty-five or seventy years of age. The right reverend prelate's features are rather large; his forehead high; nose prominent; and cheeks somewhat sunk. He has quick eyes, very little dark grey hair, combed straight upon the head, and a slight whisker. Upon the whole there is nothing in his appearance distinguished or striking.—*Daily News.*

PRIMOGENITURE.—Perhaps one of the most powerful engines in the hand of the class which to a great degree monopolizes legislation in this country, is the iniquitous law of primogeniture. It alone enables families for centuries to be, in their peculiar districts, lords and masters; it fills the House of Commons with aristocratic nominees; it alone places in the hands of many single men an amount of annual revenue greater than that of most European sovereigns, and which is unjustly kept from a numerous clan of relatives, who are quartered by the influence of their elders on the public purse.—*Republican.*

PROGRESS OF LIGHT.—A general meeting of the Professors of the University of Konigsberg (Prussia) was held lately, at which, by a majority of 22 against 7, the resolution was carried, that in future, Jews as well as Catholics, should be admitted to the professional chairs of that University.

The negro population of St. Bartholomew, in the West Indies, have forwarded an address of thanks to the King of Sweden, for their liberation from slavery on the promulgation of the decree of October last.

BURNS AND CURRIE.—DUMFRIES AND AYR.—The old system of quarrelling about posthumous trifles connected with men of genius, in direct proportion of intensity to the neglect shown to men of genius when alive and in real need of sympathy, has been exemplified in a controversy between Dumfries and Ayr, as to which of these towns should be entrusted with the keeping of the manuscript of Dr. Currie's Life of Burns. This document is, it seems, in the hands of a gentleman in Whitehaven, who, after illustrating it with views and portraits, intends sending it to the Ayr monument. Dumfries grumbles at this, and reasons, that, although Burns was born in Ayr, Currie was born in Dumfries, and there too the bard was buried. Ayr admits these facts, but contends that "Currie's manuscript would form an appropriate companion to Highland Mary's Bible, already in their mausoleum."—*North of Scotland Gazette.*

SWEET ARE THE USES OF TEARS.—A German chemist has discovered this year that there is sugar in tears. We have been told by poets that there is "sweetness in all things," but we little thought that it lurked in the corner of every squint. We always thought that crying was a sign rather of sour disposition, but according to this new discovery, it would seem that the more a lady cries the more her temper is sweetened by it. By-the-by, hysterics must be invaluable to a cook on board-wages, who has to find her own sugar! What a lump of sweetness, too, Niobe must have been—for she was "all tears." To a grocer of the present day, she would have been invaluable, for she would have supplied him all the year round with "the very best moist."—*Comic Almanac.*

A person of the name of Thomas Thorpe, having died, his friends were about to engrave on his tomb stone the following inscription:

"This corpse
Is Tommy Thorpe's;"

but, considering it on reflection, too long, it was finally reduced thus;

"Thorpe's
Corpse."

FASTER THAN LIGHTNING.—An hydraulic telegraph is planned, and the model is to be seen gratis, at 17 Wellington-street, Strand, by which messages will be conveyed faster than by the electric telegraph.—"On we goes again." This is indeed a fast age.

REMAINS OF THE ROMAN LONDON.—At a recent meeting of the British Archæological Association, Mr. Roach Smith, announced the discovery, in Lad-lane, of a tessellated Roman pavement and of walls, about nine feet from the present street level, running underneath the street and extending at least thirty feet in length. A few years since during excavations on the opposite side of Lad-lane, in Wood-street, and by the side of St. Michael's church, tessellated pavements were laid open.—They probably all belonged to one large building; but unfortunately the remains were destroyed so rapidly that it was impossible to make correct drawings and plans. He was in hopes he should have preserved a fragment of coloured tessellated pavement found near the church, and he had sought the assistance of the town-clerk and comptroller, with a view to induce the Corporation to receive it in the Guildhall: but although those gentlemen laudably seconded his endeavours, a counteracting influence furstrated their efforts, and the pavement was broken to pieces. Mr. Smith, remarked that the position of these pavements immediately beneath Wood street and Lad-lane showed the change that had taken place in the direction of the streets of London since it was a Roman city, He had observed that most of the present streets of London, from the same cause, gave indications of their being of no very rem